Published on the 15th of the month.

Vol. XII., No. 5. AUGUST, 1922.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

A monthly Magazine to maintain the cause of
TRUTH, FREEDOM, and COMPREHENSIVENESS
in the Anglican Communion.

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS

PAGE

The Anglican and Eastern Churches 225
Venerable Beresford Potter.

Some Modern Problems of the Mission Field .. 233
IV. Missions and Politics.
Principal E. C. Dewick, M.A.

Our Partners in the Other Ship 241
Alfred Fawkes, M.A.

The Christian Religion and Miracle 252
Canon S. McComb, D.D.

Modernism and the Bible 260
Francis E. Powell, M.A.

Book Notices:—
The Divine Initiative 269
The Social Implications of Christianity .. 271
Psychology and the Christian Life 273
Two American Books on Modernism .. 274
Parents and Teachers 276
Psychology without Tears 278

Correspondence:—
Creeds or no Creeds 278
Professor P. Gardner.

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

AGENTS: SOUTH AFRICA—T. MASKEW MILLER, Cape Town.
AUSTRALIA—A. McCUBBIN & Co., 152 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne.
NEW ZEALAND—WALTER NASH, 102 Wakefield Street, Wellington.

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

All literary contributions and books for review should be addressed to:—The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Ripon Hall, Oxford.

All advertisements and orders should be addressed to:—BASIL BLACKWELL, Office of *The Modern Churchman*, 49 Broad Street, Oxford.

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION

FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF LIBERAL RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President—Professor PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq.
The ARCHDEACON OF WESTMINSTER, F.B.A.
The Rev. Canon CREMER, M.A.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE, F.B.A.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A.
The Rev. GEORGE HENSLOW, M.A.
Sir LAURENCE JONES, Bt., M.A.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE, D.D.
The Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON, M.A.
The DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.
The Rev. Canon H. P. PLUMPTRE, M.A.
J. ST. LOE STRACHEY, Esq.

Members of the Council, 1921-22.

Chairman—Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

Professor Sir W. ASHLEY, Ph.D.
Mr. P. H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Sir JOHN BARRAN, Bt., M.P.
Rev. J. WORSLEY BODEN, M.A.
Prebendary CALDECOTT, D.Litt., D.D.
Rev. A. J. CARLYLE, D.Litt.
Rev. J. R. COHU, M.A.
Hon. GILBERT COLERIDGE.
Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D.
Rev. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A.
Rev. JOHN GAMBLE, B.D.
Rev. F. G. GIVEN-WILSON, M.A.
Rev. J. C. HARDWICK, M.A.
The MASTER OF JESUS COLLEGE, CAMBS.
Rev. W. STEWART MACGOWAN, LL.D.
Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.
Mrs. MICHELMORE.
Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
Mr. CLAUD MULLINS.
Rev. W. M. PRYKE, B.D.
Rev. C. RAVEN, B.D.
The Very Rev. HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.Litt., [F.B.A.
Rev. G. RENDALL, D.Litt., LL.D.
Mrs. REITH.
Miss MAUDE ROYDEN.
Rev. E. ST. G. SCHOMBERG, M.A.
Rev. C. J. SHARP, M.A.
Rev. C. J. SHEBBEARE, B.D.
Rev. H. R. L. SHEPPARD, M.A.
Mr. NOWELL SMITH, M.A.
Canon TOLLINTON, D.D.
Mr. H. F. WALKER.

Offices—10 CLIFFORD STREET, BOND STREET, W.1.
Hon. Secretary and Treasurer—PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Assistant Hon. Secretary—MISS DOWELL.
Hon. Auditor—Mr. ROBERT WARNER, F.C.A., 14 Priory Road, Kilburn, N.W.6.
Hon. Librarian—Rev. W. M. PRYKE, B.D., St. Aidan's Vicarage, South Shields.
Hon. Secretary to the Annual Conference—Miss D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Bankers—LONDON CITY AND MIDLAND BANK, 129 New Bond Street, W.1.

AIMS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To affirm the continuous and progressive character of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in the spheres of knowledge and of conduct.
2.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to restate her doctrines from time to time in accordance with this revelation.
3.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England.
4.—To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5.—To promote the adaptation of the Church services to the needs and knowledge of the time.
6.—To assert the claim of the laity to a larger share in the government and responsible work of the Church.
7.—To foster co-operation and fellowship between the Church of England and other Christian Churches.
8.—To study the application of Christian principles and ideals to the whole of our social life.

Annual Subscription.—Members, at least 10/; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10. Cheques should be made payable to the Hon. Secretary of the Churchmen's Union.

All communications as to membership, subscriptions, changes of address, and business matters should be sent to—

The Hon. Secretary, Churchmen's Union, 10 Clifford Street, Bond Street, W.1.

The Modern Churchman is sent free to all full members of the Churchmen's Union.

Conference
OF
Modern Churchmen,
OXFORD,
August 21—28, 1922.

Conference Committee.

Canon Glazebrook, D.D.

P. H. Bagenal, O.B.E.
Miss C. Barber
Preb. Caldecott, D.Litt.
C. W. Emmet, B.D.
H. D. A. Major, B.D.
Miss D. Nussey
Mrs Reith

The Conference this year will be held at Oxford, where by the kindness of the authorities Somerville College has been placed at the disposal of the committee.

Christianity as the World Religion will be the subject for discussion.

The Conference will begin on Monday *afternoon*, August 21st, and will end on Monday *morning*, August 28th. The programme proper will end on Saturday *morning*, but it is thought that the extra days will be appreciated by those able to afford the time.

The Conference will be open to members of the Churchmen's Union, and also as far as space will allow, to those who are in sympathy with its principles and objects.

Tickets (including board and lodging) will be £3 15s. 0d. for the week; £2 15s. 0d. for the first five days. *If not paid before August 5th an extra charge of 5/- will be made.* A limited number of persons finding their own accommodation may have meals at Somerville at a reasonable charge. Tickets for the meetings only will be 15/-, for those engaged in teaching 7/6. Admission to single meetings 2/-.

Meals. Breakfast 8-45, Lunch 1-15, Tea 4-30, Dinner 7 o'clock.

Tennis. A small charge will be made for the use of the courts and balls.

Hon. Secretary—Dora Nussey, Westfield, Ilkley.
Hon. Press Secretary—P. H. Bagenal,
11 Spencer Hill, Wimbledon, S.W. 19.

ALL APPLICATIONS for Tickets, accompanied by full remittance, and a stamped addressed envelope, should be made to Miss Nussey. Address after August 17th: Somerville College.

NINTH CONFERENCE OF MODERN CHURCHMEN

1922

Christianity as the World Religion

MORNING SESSIONS at 10-15

Tuesday, Aug. 22. The Evolution of Religion.

Principal F. B. JEVONS, D. Litt., Hatfield Hall, Durham.

Mr A. CLUTTON BROCK

Wednesday, Aug. 23. Christianity and its place in history.

Rev. J. M. CREED, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D., Fellow of University College, Oxford.

Thursday, Aug. 24. Christianity and the Western World of to-day.

Miss LILY DOUGALL

Miss A. MAUDE ROYDEN

Friday, Aug. 25. Christianity and the non-Western World.

Rev. DUKINFIELD ASTLEY, D.Litt.

Professor ALBAN WIDGERY, M.A. The College, Baroda.

Saturday, Aug. 26. Christianity and the future.

Professor W. R. MATTHEWS, D.D., Dean of Divinity, King's College, London.

Dr. SELBIE, Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford.

EVENING SESSIONS at 8-30

Subject—Rivals of Christianity.

Monday.	Introductory Address	Professor Percy Gardner, D.Litt., L.L.D., F.B.A., President of the Churchmen's Union.
Tuesday.	Mohammedism	Rev. R. F. McNeile, M.A., formerly of Cairo.
Wednesday.	Buddhism	Professor Soothill, Professor of Chinese at Oxford.
Thursday.	Hinduism (including reform movements)	Rev. E. Greaves, formerly of N. India.
Friday.	Confucianism	Rev. A. C. Moule, M.A., formerly of China.

Aug. 27th—The Conference Sermons will be preached in St. Mary's, at 11 and 7. The preacher in the morning will be the Ven. R. H. Charles, D.D., F.B.A., Archdeacon of Westminster.

Hemsley & Sons, Printers, Ilkley.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 5. AUGUST, 1922. Vol. XII.

THE ANGLICAN AND EASTERN CHURCHES

By the Venerable Beresford Potter, Archdeacon in Cyprus.

'How greatly is to be desired the union of the Churches. But how difficult it is for a movement, started with that end in view, to wing its flight with the desire pure and simple, of arriving at the truth—a desire altogether free from any bias, or partiality towards preconceived opinions.'

Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow, A.D. 1865.

MANY Anglicans are interesting themselves at the present time in furthering closer relations with the Eastern Churches. The War caused a startling change of sentiment, even among stiff Churchmen, towards British Nonconformists: and it is not unnatural that a certain section of our people should extend this larger sentiment towards a Church which possesses what many of us consider valuable, and others essential, apostolic succession, and a long history.

But the question begins to press on us, What is the best method of approach towards our Eastern sister: and what is the exact object in view in that effort? Surely it ought to be that we may help her in matters where she needs help, and that we may learn from her in others where she has the power to aid us.

With regard to the former point, with which only I can now find space to deal, we must bear in mind the peculiar history of the Eastern Church. Owing, among other reasons, to the

fact that no emperor after Constantine dwelt at Rome, and that from A.D. 476 to A.D. 800 there was no emperor in Italy, the Western Church, in the absence of the emperor, obtained secular powers for its chief bishop, so large that at one time the Pope claimed and even exercised the right to elect and crown the emperor.

Exactly the reverse was the case in the East. The Church was under the power of the secular ruler. So, while the energies of the Western Church were largely occupied with political problems, the East gave its thoughts to theological controversy. As Lord Bryce well puts it:

> 'In the East, the passionate theological controversies regarding the Trinity and Incarnation, which had filled the minds of the laity and clergy from the fourth to the seventh century, led to the exaltation of doctrinal orthodoxy as the central and vital element in the Christian life. The full acceptance, in the exactly right sense, of all the dogmas enunciated by the Church is specially and pre-eminently distinctive of the Eastern Church.
>
> 'This fettering of the mind by the decrees of ancient Councils, this concentration of attention on abstract and sometimes scarcely comprehensible propositions is doubtless accountable, not only for a deficient sense of the duty of the Church to enforce morality, but also for much of the glacial torpor, which the history of Eastern Christianity sets before us.'

The persistency of this tendency is illustrated by the words of the Rev. J. O. Bagdon Smith, English Chaplain at Zante, about the middle of last century. He remarks that

> 'the upper and educated classes in Greece are sunk in rationalism, alienated from the services of religion, deterred from attending public worship by its cumbrous services.'

The case of Theophilus Cairy, a man of learning and morality, a priest of the Eastern Church, shows the same thing. He was arrested in 1851 for teaching doctrines not approved by the Church. He was asked to repeat the Nicene Creed, stating at the same time that he believed it in his heart; and, not being able to do this, was condemned to seven years' imprisonment by command of the Government, urged on by the Church.

Some years ago, the Princess Dagmar went through a form of reconciliation with the Orthodox Communion previous to her marriage with the Grand Duke Héretier. This included a four-fold renunciation of the errors of Lutheranism, and a profession of faith in 'the dogmas, traditions, and ordinances of

our Orthodox Church,' contained in ten articles, among which occurred the following words:

> 'I believe and confess that the Holy Graeco-Russian Church is the bride of Christ, and that in her is true salvation to be found, and that no one can possibly be saved in any except her.'[1]

In an answer sent by the Eastern patriarchs, in A.D. 1718, to a proposal of the English Non-jurors for a *concordat* between the orthodox and themselves, occur these words:

> 'The true, and most pure faith of our Lord Jesus Christ continues only with us orthodox Greeks, and is by nobody else preserved unadulterated. It must of necessity be said that the faith of our Lord was preserved, and shone only among us orthodox, oriental, Grecian Christians.'[2]

In a synodical letter sent to 'the lovers of the Greek Church in Britain' by the Œcumenical Patriarch and others, in A.D. 1672, are these words:

> 'Concerning the Catholic Orthodox Church of Christ, we say it is infallible, as being under the direction of its proper head, who is Christ, who is the truth itself.'

In 1691 was published a synodical explication of the eucharist, signed by the Œcumenical Patriarch and others, in which it is explained that after consecration the bread and wine are changed into the real body and blood of Christ: and it condemns those who read writings denying this to 'anathema, deprivation, the damnation of eternal fire, and the curses of Fathers, and synods.'[3]

In the Confession of Faith of the Greek Church[4] these words occur:

> 'Children need salvation, and consequently baptism. For they who die, being not regenerated, are liable to eternal torments for original sin, as not having been cleansed from it: therefore they cannot be saved without baptism.'
>
> 'Baptism blots out original sin, delivers from eternal pains, gives immortality.'

The Empress Irene, dethroned in A.D. 802, who had blinded her own son to further her ambition, was afterwards canonised by the Greek Church for her restoration of image worship.

In a catechism approved by the Patriarch and Synod of Constantinople, translated by C. Delavel Cobham, C.M.G.,

[1] See Madame Romanoff's *Sketches of the Graeco-Russian Church*, pp. 523 seqq. London, 1868.

[2] See Williams, *Orthodox Church of the East*, p. 18.

[3] See Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

[4] See *Synodus Bethlehemitica*, printed at Paris, 1676.

1902, the Eastern Orthodox Church is said to be the only true Church; and everlasting punishment of the individual is taught.

In 1888, Russian converts in Japan, at the 9th centenary of the Russian Church celebration at Kieff, wrote this congratulation:

> 'It is the Orthodox Church alone which has preserved the Divine doctrine just as it was committed to her, and will preserve it unchanged to the end of the ages, as the Spirit of God preserveth her from all error.'

In a letter which I have recently received from a layman, well qualified to speak about the Orthodox Church, he says:

> 'She is adamant on the question of dogma. Not only must the Nicene Creed be firmly held, but the dogmatic clauses of the seven Œcumenical Councils are to be received as infallible.'

Now the question is whether we in the West who have had some experience of this uncompromising dogmatic spirit in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the 'bloody' Mary persecutions, the slaughters of the Vaudois, Albigenses, &c., think it a kind and brotherly line of action to encourage this dangerous tendency: or whether it is not better, on the other hand, to stretch forth a helping hand to show our Eastern brethren the difference between faith in iron, possibly soul-killing, formulas, and the love of God and love of truth, which, due to God's mercy, underlies them, even when promulgated by Councils disgraced with riot and stained with murder. An Oxford theologian recently wrote to me:

> 'I am quite convinced that so far as the Eastern Orthodox want to be associated with us, it is because we give them what they have not got.'

In a conversation which I had some years ago with the late Œcumenical patriarch, I was explaining to him the object of a scheme for educating in England Eastern clergy to minister in British Colonies to their co-religionists; and I said to him that we did not want to interfere with their faith, but simply to initiate them into English ways, the English language, and colonial problems: his reply was:

> 'You would do much more than this. You would imbue them with spiritual and missionary zeal.'

When the present Archbishop of Cyprus recently honoured me by meeting and speaking to a few friends at my club in London, I asked him to tell us what was the feature of English Church life which struck him most. His reply was the preva-

lence of sermons tending to elevate the lives of the congregations, and he added that on his return to Cyprus he would aim at encouraging this practice in Eastern Orthodox Churches.

Regarding the method of approach to the Eastern Church, we may admit the desirability of securing some basis of agreement, such as was recently attempted in the document drawn up by the E.C.U. But a fault in that document seems to me to be the failure to distinguish between the underlying infallible truth enshrined in a dogma, and the dogma itself. Few liberally minded Anglicans could accept such words as that the decrees of the four Œcumenical Councils are 'incontrovertible, and must be believed by all Christians,' though most would probably agree that the Holy Spirit so guided the early Church that underneath the formal statements of its Councils, of which our Articles assert the *fallibility*, there is a substratum of infallible truth. To give an example, the Creed of Nicaea guarded against Arianism. This heresy undoubtedly weakened belief in the Incarnation, because it taught that the Divine in Christ was created, and did not exist from all eternity. But is not the real practical value for man of the Incarnation doctrine the faith preserved by it that man is partaker of the Divine Nature; that a real Divinity, existent from eternity, manifested itself perfectly in Christ, imperfectly but progressively in the human race? This great revelation, made clear by Christ, would be dimmed if we admitted that the Divine in Christ was created at a fixed period of time. But to believe that the Nicene Creed safeguarded this is a different thing from believing that the terms used to express it are infallible.

Or again with regard to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, the real, practical, essential teaching for man in this seems to me to be that God is spirit, Who can dwell in man because of the incarnation of God in man, clearly manifested in the Person of Christ. But the way in which this teaching has been expressed, so far from being infallible, has proved a stumbling block to many, especially Moslems, who, in spite of all explanations, still believe that Christians worship three Gods. Or, again, to instance the doctrine of the Eucharist, the important thing is surely not the literal, or non-literal, meaning of the words: 'This is my body, this is my blood.' To quarrel about this seems to me to be tithing mint, anise, and cummin. Is not

the important thing the spiritual fact that the bread and wine of the Holy Communion supplant the flesh and blood in the Pascal Feast as symbols and channels for the strengthening and refreshing of the soul by Divine grace. It does not seem to be a matter to be fought over by the Church how this grace is conveyed in the sacrament. Is not the important thing the belief that to the faithful recipient it is conveyed?

We might in this spirit approach, not only the decisions of the four great General Councils, but also of the fifth, sixth and seventh Councils which are accepted as well in the East. The fifth Council in A.D. 553 was a partial reaction against the fourth, and a partial movement in the direction of Monophysitism.[5] The Monophysites fought for one nature in Christ, the Council of Chalcedon having decided for two natures but one person. It came to be felt that the idea of two natures, Divine and human, co-existing in Christ, might lead to an unreal view of His Divinely-human personality, and consequently of His value as our exemplar.

The sixth Council (A.D. 680) condemned the one-will doctrine of the Monotheletes. But this teaching also made Christ unreal, because it practically banished his human will, and made the Divine in him the only power. We may interpret the decisions of the sixth Council as an effort to preserve belief in the complete co-action in human life of the Divine and human.

The seventh Council (A.D. 787) allowed the use of pictures, and held that 'whosoever does reverence to an image does reverence to the person represented by it.' There is nothing to quarrel with here. The main thing is that the reverence should extend to the Divine Person, and not rest in the picture.

It seems, therefore, clear enough that, if we interpret creeds, and conciliar decisions, in their spirit, and not in the letter, and if we consider them not only in their speculative or intellectual aspects, but also in their practical bearings on human life, we may much more easily establish a basis of agreement between ourselves and Easterns, and we may really help them in their interpretation of dogma.

Professor Vasili Sokoloff, of Moscow Academy, in his 'enquiry into the Hierarchy of the Anglican Episcopal Church,

[5] Adeney, *Greek and Eastern Churches*, p. 120.

A.D. 1897,' decided in favour of Anglican Orders, but he adds 'the only doubt is whether the Anglican Church regards Holy Orders as in any sense a Sacrament.' If she does, he adds, Orthodox theologians would have no difficulty in acknowledging the validity of Anglican Orders: and he defines a sacrament as 'something which conveys a certain assurance that Grace is given in it.' Surely no reasonable Anglican could quarrel with a demand that Orders should be looked on by them as a Sacrament *in this sense of the word.*

I am quite willing to admit that the Eastern Church to-day, as a whole, takes a different view from this. Her theological system is largely based on the conception that infallibility attaches to decisions put forth by Councils which represented the whole Church: and she, like some English theologians, interprets our Lord's promise of leading His disciples into all truth as being fulfilled in the decisions of the Œcumenical Councils. But may it not be more reasonably held that what our Lord meant was that spiritual truth would come to those who led pure and holy lives, doubtless through the agency of His Church, *i.e.* to say that imperfect human formulas, more especially those arrived at by the Councils, would convey to spiritually-minded souls spiritual truth for the sustenance of their spiritual and moral nature?

The Romans have sought verbal infallibility in the Pope's decrees; the Easterns in the decisions of General Councils; the Protestants in the Bible. But the question remains, does our Heavenly Father really desire that we should possess verbal infallibility, or is it not rather His method to lead men's souls to lean on Him? Did He not mean to teach men that they must live the truth, if they would know the truth, although possibly some might prefer to know it without living it? The English Church can assist the East to view and use dogma in this free and helpful fashion.

But a further way of helping the East is by teaching it how to adopt and use the results of modern critical and historical studies in its understanding and interpretation of the Bible.

When the higher criticism is removing what even here in England many old-fashioned Christians regard as essentials of the Christian faith, what must the less-instructed Easterns think about it? If the Book of Genesis was not written by

Moses; if Genesis contains two creation stories contradicting each other in important points, and apparently derived from pre-existing Babylonian guesses at the world's origin, how are we to trust the Bible? If the Book of Daniel was not written by Daniel and yet Christ quoted it as his, what about our Lord's authority as a teacher? If it be found that our former views of the mode of our Lord's birth and resurrection have to be modified in a considerable degree, how far is this to go, and how can our faith be, in essentials, saved? If man was not created in a moment of time, but evolved from the brute life, how can man be immortal, and the child of God? And how can the commonly received doctrine of the atonement of Christ be consistent with the fact that human beings lived and died millions of years before our Lord suffered on the Cross?

These are the sort of questions which the Christian believers of this age are being met with: and which the learned and liberal-minded in the West are seeking to solve. Shall we not stretch out our hand to our Eastern sister, and aid her in clarifying her views in the light of newly revealed truth, so that she may still grasp and live, not by the husk of dead or misstated dogma, but by the inner kernel of vital soul-saving truth?

A brief quotation from a recent article in *Ecclesiastike Aletheia*, in which Professor Komnenos summarises the attitude of the Œcumenical Patriarch Meletius towards Christian reunion, indicates both the influence of the West on the East, and also the best way in which we English Churchmen can serve the Orthodox Church:

> 'What I am endeavouring to express and what, unless I am mistaken, gives the meaning of the truly inspired reply of His Holiness to the address of the Professors of the Theological College of Halki, is that while resting upon those fundamental truths which mark our particular character as Orthodox, we ought to have our heart enlarged, as the Apostles bade us, and not narrow, towards all who confess the Name of Christ, and whose faith in God is founded upon the one and the same foundation of the salvation of men through Christ.
>
> 'With our heart and mind so disposed and studying with a sternly scientific and impartial spirit the history of the Church from the beginning, we shall soon be found in the happy position of being able to distinguish the essential and principal from the non-essential and secondary, and instead of raising new barriers will be able to loosen gradually those which exist; so that by degrees it will become possible that those, who yesterday or to-day have been alienated and hostile, may perceive more deeply those bands which unite them to one another, and may stretch out hands of friendship and of communion.'

SOME MODERN PROBLEMS OF THE MISSION FIELD

By the Rev. E. C. Dewick, M.A., Acting Principal of St. Paul's College, Calcutta; formerly Principal of St. Aidan's, Birkenhead. Author of *Primitive Christian Eschatology.*

IV. *Missions and Politics.*

THE relation between politics and religion is an old subject for debate. Are they enemies, or allies, or entirely independent of each other? In the foreign mission field, these are questions of great urgency at the present time. The Christian missionary finds himself subject to political pressure from many sides. His support is desired by many in the political sphere who have little interest in his religious aims; and he for his part knows that his work may be either helped or hindered by their friendliness or hostility.

Hence, if the missionary approaches this subject from the point of view of expediency, he may well find himself in considerable perplexity. Take, for instance, the position in many of the mission-stations of India. On the one side are the members of the Engilsh community, with which the missionary is associated by ties of birth, and (very often) of personal friendship. They naturally expect that he, as their countryman, will share their political outlook and aspirations; and if he appears to be lukewarm in this, their prevalent indifference to missions will be changed into an attitude of definite hostility, which may prove a serious hindrance to his work.

From the older generation of native Christians comes (in many cases) pressure of a similar kind. They may at times give full vent to criticisms of their missionary-sahib; but they look to him for protection against their non-Christian fellow-countrymen; and if he shows a political bias towards 'Nationalism,' he will find himself regarded by the older 'loyalist' Christians with mingled contempt and dislike—with contempt, as a traitor to his own country; and with dislike, as an unfaithful shepherd who is ready to hand over his flock to the tender

mercies of the heathen. So the combined influence of the European community and the older generation of Indian Christians tends to induce the missionary in India to lean towards the British side in the present political strife.

On the other hand, in many stations, and especially in educational centres, there is pressure of another kind at work. The missionary who desires to reach the hearts of Indian schoolboys or students knows that there is no more tempting short cut to popularity than a profession of sympathy with 'the legitimate aims of the National Movement.' If only he can gain a reputation for being 'pro-Indian' in his political outlook, his opportunities for influence and friendship among the younger generation will be greater, and his path will be in many ways smoother and more pleasant.

So the pressure comes from more than one side; and in view of the difficulty of deciding, on grounds of expediency, which side is likely to be the more profitable (or the less harmful) to the missionary cause, there are many who are of opinion that the Christian missionary should take no part at all in politics. In the case of some missionary societies, indeed, this is a definite rule, to which all their agents are expected to conform. In support of this policy of political neutrality, it is possible to point to many instances in the past, in which missionary-politicians have brought disaster upon themselves, and discredit upon their religion, by allowing themselves to become entangled in political intrigues, or dragged into the vortex of unedifying political controversies. Such dangers are real; and they provide a strong case in favour of political neutrality.

On the other hand, there is an unmistakable and growing conviction in the Christian Church, that it is unwise to attempt to make too sharp a division between 'sacred' and 'secular' in human affairs, and that the Christian religion, if it is to be true to its own highest ideals, cannot consent to limit its activities to a programme which shall be purely ecclesiastical, or purely individualistic. The 'Christianization of all life'—social, national and international, as well as personal—is a vision which is evoking a response from the best minds in modern Christendom. But if the foreign missionary is to respond to that vision, he will be led into fields of action which

are at least not far from the domain of politics. Some of the finest chapters in missionary history are those which tell of the struggle against the slave-trade, against forced labour, against all kinds of tyranny and oppression; and in all such cases, the charge of 'meddling in politics' has been brought (not without some reason) against the missionaries by their opponents. Such actions have, indeed, been dangerous, and may often have seemed inexpedient; but their justification has lain in the higher appeal to the great principles of God's will and way, which have been revealed in Christ, and to which alone, in the last resort, the Christian missionary owes his unconditional allegiance.

Do these great Christian principles enable us to indicate any specific lines of political action, which are at the present time not only permissible, but obligatory for the Christian missionary, by virtue of his commission as a preacher of the Gospel? I believe that, in some cases, the answer is in the affirmative.

In the first place, there are certain 'racial characteristics,' both on the side of the Englishman and of the native, which are unquestionably contrary to the mind of Christ, and which call for emphatic condemnation from the Christian minister, even though such condemnation may evoke the criticism that the speaker is transgressing the proper limits of his spiritual domain.

Let us take one or two instances. In India to-day, the distinctive characteristic of the average European is his effort to affirm his superiority over the Indian. The expression of this varies, from the quiet, reserved dignity of the Government official, or the benevolent patronage of the older missionary, down to the vulgar assertiveness of the English shop-assistant, or the cheap insolence of the Eurasian ticket-collector. But underlying these variations is the same consciousness of racial superiority, which is one of the deepest convictions of the Englishman in foreign lands.

Now is this consciousness justifiable on Christian grounds? In certain individual cases, I believe it may be. Where the missionary is the one and only educated man in his district, or the Government official stands (as he often does stand) head

and shoulders above all his Indian colleagues in character and ability, it would be mere hypocrisy to pretend that there ought to be no sense of superiority. But it is quite another matter when the Englishman is dealing with Indians who have proved themselves—sometimes by passing our own academic tests on our own English soil—to be our equals in education and ability. Such men have generally been treated in this country with courtesy, and even with honour; but on their return to their own land, they find that the majority of Englishmen there resent any claim to equality on the part of the Indian, and try to meet all such claims with insults and rebuffs. The Englishman's sense of racial superiority, which in the old days expanded unchallenged into a mood of paternal geniality, is to-day irritated by the sense of rivalry on all sides, and darkened by the shadow of a growing fear of the native, whom formerly he regarded with good-humoured contempt. So he often tries to conceal his anxieties by nervous assertions of his own superiority, and by the constant reiteration of every story and rumour which goes to prove the physical, mental, and moral depravity of the native.

It is this spirit of mingled fear and contempt which underlies those acts of discourtesy which are continually exasperating Indian opinion, and which are daily recorded (and exaggerated) in the Nationalist Press. The grosser acts are fortunately confined to a small section of the British community in India; though I have myself seen, during the last few months, only too many incidents which, had I been an Indian, would have made my blood boil; and which have made me, as an Englishman, sick with shame. I have seen Indian ladies turned out of their railway-carriages in the middle of the night in order to make room for an English army officer; I have seen a room full of European men and women in a railway refreshment-room giggling with glee at a rude remark audibly made by one of their number at the Indian dress of a Bengali gentleman sitting at an adjoining table; I have seen an English shop-assistant deliberately spit into a group of well-to-do Indians, in order to 'show off' before his best girl his contempt for the 'niggers.' Such acts are exceptional, but frequent enough to have a most serious effect on Indian opinion. And behind this

is something which, perhaps, hurts the Indian even more; namely, the constant behaviour of English people who are too well-bred to indulge in vulgar rudeness, but who are able to express, by the curt reply, or the slight shrug of the shoulder, or the patronising smile, their assurance of the white man's indefeasible superiority.

Are these things outside the scope of the Christian message? Or are they a challenge to the principles of Christian brotherhood and courtesy which lie hid in our Lord's message of the Love of God?

Yet how rarely have we Christian missionaries cared to speak plainly to our own countrymen on this subject. Perhaps we have feared to arouse a storm of protest, or to risk the loss of some valued financial support. Or perhaps we have hesitated to speak because we know that our own hearts are by no means free from all taint of racial prejudice.

The 'Mission of Help' from England to the English-speaking congregations in India will shortly be on its way. Surely the Christian message at such a time must include not only the appeal for greater intensity in the life of prayer, and for greater regularity in the life of worship, but also for a serious reconsideration of our British attitude and conduct towards our fellow-men and women of Indian birth.

> 'If a man love not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God Whom he hath not seen?'

But there is also much need for plain-speaking on the Indian side. If the European has his distinctive racial faults, so also has the Indian. It is not my intention to expatiate at length upon these in the present article, because I believe that it is better that criticism on both sides should come from the lips of fellow-countrymen, rather than that each race should try to point out the motes (or beams) in the other's eye. Suffice it to say that it seems to me that many Indians—both Christian and non-Christian—are too ready at the present time to drift with the popular current of race-hatred against the European, to give blind credit to every malicious tale that is spread, to forget old ties of friendship and gratitude, and to give free rein to a wild emotionalism which flings aside every appeal to

reason and foresight. These are sins which need emphatic condemnation in the Name of Christ. But the Indian preacher who has the courage to speak with plainness on these matters will certainly incur the charge that he is a political minion of the British Raj, and that he is forsaking his proper sphere as a minister of the Gospel. Nevertheless, his message will, I believe, be essentially Christ's message of truth and soberness.

So far, we have been thinking only of points where the Christian message at least trenches upon the verge of politics. But are there cases in which the Christian missionary must go further, definitely invading the political arena, and taking sides in its combats? In the great world-conflict between Imperialism and Nationalism, Autocracy and Democracy, is the Christian, *qua* Christian, called upon to intervene?

To answer this, we need to go back to the great fundamentals of Christ's revelation. What did He show us of the methods by which God rules the world? May they be called 'autocratic' or 'democratic,' 'Prussianist' or 'Pacifist'?

An adequate answer would require a volume. But if we take Christ as the supreme revelation of God, there are one or two points which seem to stand out clearly.

In the first place, God has shown us through Christ that He loves freedom, with all its attendant dangers, better than the security of strict orderliness imposed by an external force. For if the latter had been acceptable to God, His Son would surely have come in the form of a mighty ruler, breaking down all opposition, and bringing all his opponents into submission to Himself by the exercise of irresistible force. But it was not thus that Christ came; rather, He came in weakness, with only the appeal of Love, which men were free to accept or to refuse. He came as 'a sign spoken against,' so that 'the thoughts of many hearts were revealed' by their free response to His appeal—or by their refusal to respond. Surely it follows that (if God was in Christ) He loves the free response, with all its inevitable uncertainties, better than the safety of an enforced submission to His will.

Now if this is so, then in the field of politics, where there is often a struggle between a policy which is striving towards a wider liberty, and a policy which clings always to the alleged

'safety' of methods of force and repression, the Christian, if true to his Master, must incline towards the more liberal policy. Not that he will necessarily eschew all use of force; for he would be a bold man who would affirm that force has no place in the methods of the Divine Government of the world. In the education whether of children or of nations, the use of force is almost universally applied at certain stages; but in so far as the education succeeds in its purpose, the use of force becomes continually less. In the field of politics, the use of force is at times inevitable and justifiable. But when the Christian finds himself confronted—as in many parts of the mission field to-day—by two conflicting policies—on the one hand, the policy which (admirably represented by Bismarck in the nineteenth century, and by the *Morning Post* in the twentieth century) puts its whole trust in naked force, and assures us that 'the Asiatic (or African) understands no other argument'; and on the other hand, the policy which sets its face steadily towards the vision of widening liberty, with all its dangers and all its possibilities—can a true Christian rightly remain neutral in a political situation such as this?

Again, if we see God in Christ, we can see in Christ God's attitude towards men as 'ends in themselves.' There is no hint, as far as I know, in the New Testament, that Christ ever *used* other men for His own convenience. To Him, each human life is something to be treated with courtesy and with affectionate interest, as something worth developing for its own sake, in the sight of God.

Now this may appear but a platitude; but it comes into sharp conflict with many political theories in foreign lands, which rest upon the assumption (implicit or explicit) that the white man's interests must always be paramount, and that the interests of the native can only be considered as an afterthought. The word 'exploitation' has an ugly sound, and would be generally repudiated; but the thing signified by that word dominates the political outlook and policy of a large number of the missionary's fellow-countrymen overseas.

The fierce criticism to which the British Government in India is subjected by a large section of the British community in that country, is due just to this fact, that the Government of

India has, on the whole, tried to give increasing recognition to the claims of its Indian subjects, even when those claims do not immediately coincide with European interests.

Faced with a conflict such as this, the Christian missionary is, in my judgment, fully justified in 'taking sides' in politics. He will find himself challenged by all those who regard the native as 'a mere animal'; and the deep-rooted persistence of that point of view comes out again and again in times of crisis. One need only recall how the shooting of five hundred Indians at Jallianwalla Bagh in 1919 was enthusiastically acclaimed by every European Association in India, on the ground that it probably saved the lives of English folk in the Punjab; or how the suffocation of nearly fifty Indian prisoners in a railway van in Malabar this year was lightly referred to in the Anglo-Indian Press as 'an unfortunate incident'—'unfortunate,' because it would be liable to increase anti-British agitation! Such remarks, often slipping out unawares, show how general is the instinctive assumption that the dark man exists only for the white man's convenience, and that the last-named consideration alone must dominate our political policy. Can we, in the light of Christ's teaching and example, tolerate any such assumption?

Lastly, it is surely clear from Christ's teaching that He regarded mankind as a single unit—the family of God's children. If so, then all sectional movements—Nationalist, Imperialist, or any other—are only justifiable in so far as they help towards the welfare of the wider whole. Christ knew how quickly all such movements become self-centred and aggressive. Perhaps that was why He so firmly refused to commit Himself to the Jewish Nationalism of His day, while yet He foresaw that Roman Imperialism would be the mouthpiece of His condemnation to death.

The Christian missionary need not be unsympathetic towards the enthusiasms which are so quickly generated alike by Indian Nationalism and British Imperialism; but it is his duty to estimate these movements with discernment as well as with sympathy, and to insist that neither the shouting of 'Bande Mataram' nor the singing of 'God save the King' can be a satisfactory substitute for the deeper loyalty to those great prin-

ciples of love to God and service to man, which are set forth in the life and teaching of our Lord.

It is these principles which must determine, in the last resort, the missionary's attitude and policy in the world of politics. Guided by these, he will come forward sometimes as critic, sometimes as ally, often as friend; but never as the unconditional adherent of any political party, because that would be a bondage inconsistent with Christian liberty, which is the heritage of all those who have given themselves to God for His service, and have been called by Him to be not only His servants, but His friends.

OUR PARTNERS IN THE OTHER SHIP

By the Rev. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A., author of *Studies in Modernism*, &c.

I.

THE allegorical use of Scripture has ceased to be comprehensible to us. We no longer see in the Papacy and the Empire the two great lights of the Creation story; or in the two powers, the spiritual and the temporal, given to the Roman Pontiff, the two swords of the Passion narrative; we find it difficult to realize that there was a time when people thought in this way. But the application of a classical phrase to circumstances which present a certain analogy to those under which it was originally used may still emphasize the similarity between the two situations. There is a sense in which the Nonconformists may be spoken of as our 'partners,' because the service of God among the English people is our common cause; they are 'in another ship,' because they are separated from us by certain sectional and sectarian differences; and it is to be desired that there should be a reciprocal *communicatio in sacris* between us and them, because the points on which we differ are fewer and less important than those on which we are agreed.

II.

Looked at from the standpoint of its dealings with Nonconformity, the Church of England has a bad record. 'Nay, my sons,' was the reproach of the venerable Eli to the degenerate

priesthood of Israel, 'for it is no good report that I hear.' And what Dr. Arnold describes as 'the party of Hophni and Phinehas'[1] is still with us, differences of opinion in religion having an unhappy tendency to bring out all that is least admirable in human nature, its special *habitat* being the so-called 'religious' press. I hope that Nonconformists do not judge us by this religious, or Church, press. If they do, they do us a great injustice. Not long ago I asked a prominent clergyman whether he had read an article on 'Church Finance'—I may say in passing that it was a very excellent article—in a certain Church paper. 'No,' he said; 'I never see it'—naming the paper; 'for I feel that I could not remain a Christian if I did.' The feeling was natural. 'There is no one in all the world with whom it is so difficult to sympathize (says a moralist) as with the narrower fanatics of our own particular faith.'[2] The attitude of the party represented by this press is calculated to increase the resentment felt by many Nonconformists at what seems to them the privileged position of the Church; *i.e.* its Establishment, or connection with the State, and the possession of those ancient endowments whose object was the maintenance of English religion as such. This they regard as an injustice; while what has been called the State control of religion—I should rather call it the State control of the clergy, which is by no means the same thing—is held to be an encroachment of Cæsar on the things that are God's.

III.

The connection between Church and State in England dates from a time when the two were literally two sides, or aspects, of one and the same community. The statesmen of the Reformation period had no intention of destroying this unity. It would have been unsafe for them to do so. It was not till religious differences had ceased to be a danger to the commonwealth that they could be tolerated. Queen Elizabeth, in particular, made the religious unity of the nation an essential feature of her policy: her ecclesiastical settlement was comprehensive; but conformity to it was enforced by law. We

[1] *Life and Correspondence*, p. 353.
[2] *Miscellanies* I, p. 48. Lord Morley of Blackburn.

may regret the necessity: Campion was probably a better man than Walsingham, and the writer of the Marprelate Tracts than the bishops. But the Government had to choose between the substance and the forms of freedom; had it hesitated, the Reformation in this country would have gone down in blood and fire. Scarcely, indeed, even as a European movement, could it have survived such a blow. Is it not, in Hooker's phrase:

> 'The true inscription, style, and title of all the Churches in this realm'—and, it may well be, beyond it—'by the goodness of Almighty God and His servant Elizabeth, we are?'[3]

IV.

The Royal Supremacy, originally a defence of our national independence against the usurped jurisdiction of the Papacy, was diverted by the Stuart kings to the support of absolutism. And when, after a century of political and religious conflict, the Protestant succession was established, the Toleration Act of 1689 was a recognition of the now obvious fact that the corporate unity of English religious life was, taken literally, at an end. It is too easily assumed that this was a misfortune. Values which could scarcely have been preserved in any one organization have survived in the several Churches; and the acute hostility to religion which a powerful ecclesiastical corporation seldom fails to excite in a secular, or lay, civilization, is happily a foreign growth on our soil. On the other hand, it gave a certain pettiness to English theology. How seldom does the name of an English divine occur in a foreign bibliography! The field on which we move is small. Till the rise of the Oxford Movement the differences between Churchmen and Dissenters were rather political and ecclesiastical than religious; and when their discussions were at their height, the greatest of Anglican divines characterized the points at issue as being 'in truth such silly things that very easiness doth make them hard to be disputed in serious manner.'[4] The futility of these controversies did not, however, make them less bitter; and when they ceased to turn on the *minutiæ* of ceremonial—the liturgy, the surplice and the like—the 'Ornaments of the

[3] *Ecclesiastical Polity*. Dedication of Book V.
[4] Hooker. *Ecclesiastical Polity*. Dedication of Book V.

Church and of the ministers thereof' are still, I believe, in dispute in ecclesiastical circles—they concentrated on certain mixed questions (tests, church rates, education, burials, &c.), where temper rather than principle stood in the way of the relief of the Nonconformists from real grievances; the result being an atmosphere of estrangement which too easily passed over into one of ill-will.

V.

This attitude has been of late years modified. It would be too much to assume that general feeling among Nonconformists has ceased to be opposed either to the principle or the fact of Establishment. But the question of Disestablishment is certainly less burning among them than it was when Matthew Arnold wrote *Friendship's Garland;* the climate has changed. More than one cause may be assigned for this. In Ireland, and more recently in Wales, the Church has been disestablished; but the millennium lingers; and more important issues than those of the politico-ecclesiastical order are to the fore. The disabilities under which Nonconformists laboured have been removed; under present economic conditions the financial position of the Church is neither enviable, nor (I imagine) envied, while less and less general interest is taken either in doctrinal or ritual disputes, or in denominational rivalries. In many respects this is a good thing: but the extent to which it has been carried has thrown the administration of the Churches into the hands of the small groups of enthusiasts who still attach importance to such controversies. And this is to be regretted; for its result is that religion, as it is presented to him by the Churches, makes little or no appeal to the normal man.

> 'So the elements of initiative, reform, and revolution more and more pass out of the Churches, and what was a fissure widens into a gulf.'[5]

VI.

Such demand for Disestablishment as exists to-day comes less from without the Church than from within; and its object is not, as it was a generation ago, to strengthen the Protestantism of the country, but to intensify its denominationalism

[5] *The Army and Religion.* Introduction, p. 27

—the English form of Ultramontanism, as it has been called. It is desired *e.g.* to vest the government of the National Church in certain clerical and mixed assemblies of a denominational character; and this not in order to keep the clergy under control —'whose mouths must be held by bit and bridle, lest they fall upon thee'—but in order to remove or weaken the salutary restraints imposed upon them by the existing law. By its most influential supporters it is expected that the present movement against what they describe as the State Control of Religion will work in the direction of a specialized and exclusive form of Anglicanism, claiming kindred with Catholicism, though Catholicism (in the European sense of the word) repudiates the relationship. This is, no doubt, an excellent reason why those whose sympathies are with this particular school should advocate Disestablishment; for the historical connection of Church and State is the main hindrance to the realization of their desires. But it is also an excellent reason why Nonconformists should ask themselves whether *they* are acting wisely in doing so. *Cui prodest*? Who stands to profit by it? One may pay heavily and permanently for a trifling and passing gain. There was a famous occasion in English history when the best Nonconformist mind and conscience recognized this. In 1688 the Dissenters lay under unjust laws, harshly and often cruelly administered; and when James II offered them relief under the Declaration of Indulgence they wavered. What decided them against closing with the king's offer was, as Macaulay points out, their disbelief in his sincerity, and their distrust of the influences under which he was acting.

> 'His object was to produce a conflict between the Church and the Dissenters, and thus to facilitate the triumph of the Catholics over both. A good and wise man would doubtless see very much to condemn in the conduct of the Church of England under the Stuarts. But was he therefore to join the king and the Catholics against that Church?' The trap was obvious; and the Dissenters had the good sense not to walk into it. Had they done so, they would have found themselves miserably deceived.[6]

VII.

There are strong and obvious similarities between then and now. A man may be opposed to the State control of religion;

[6] *History of England,* chapter vii.

yet, when this control is imposed by the community in self-defence, he may acquiesce in it as the lesser of two evils: he may see reasons against a Church Establishment—in a perfect commonwealth religion would, no doubt, be independent of such supports—but he may be of opinion that, given certain conditions, it is the alternative to worse, to very much worse, things. The voluntary principle is not directly religious; it is 'part of an abstract political theory with regard to the proper end and functions of the State';[7] and its application is a matter of circumstances, *i.e.* of the condition of a particular people at a particular time. These conditions are given to, not made by, us; we must deal with them not necessarily as we would, but as we can. The case against Disestablishment is that, under present conditions, it would (1) leave large country districts without provision for the religious requirements of the population; and (2) that the tendencies which stand to gain by it are those which found expression in the Oxford Movement. Nonconformity is radically opposed to these tendencies; and their development has created a wide and an increasing gulf between the lay and the clerical mind.

VIII.

With regard to the first of these considerations, the mission of a National Church differs widely from that of a denomination. With few exceptions, a man is a member of a denomination from personal choice and conviction; but more often than not he finds himself belonging to a Church from circumstances—an Englishman is, as a rule, an Anglican; a Scotsman a Presbyterian; a Frenchman a Roman Catholic—and it does not occur to him to be anything else. The Scripture parallel, then, to the denomination is the 'garden enclosed' of the *Canticles*; to the Church, 'the great and wide sea, wherein are all things creeping innumerable, both small and great beasts'—the ignorant, the indifferent, the nominal believer are there. The sober, godly Puritans who formed, at least originally, the staple of English Dissent, had personally no use for a Church of this kind. They were austere; they would not 'know a wicked person'; they were able and willing

[7] Bishop Thirlwall. *Charge*, 1860.

to provide themselves and their families with the religious privileges which they desired. But with the mixed multitude which owns a loose and occasional allegiance to the larger Churches it is otherwise, particularly in England, where ideas are few and spiritual life is at a low ebb. More especially is this the case to-day, when the backwash of the war 'prevails exceedingly upon the earth.' Read Sir Philip Gibbs' *Back to Life*, if you would realize the extent to which this is so; it is a lifelike study of post-war psychology; the thing is there. Religion is, indeed, more than a social bond; but it *is* a social bond, and an indispensable one. A village community of farm labourers, or the small casual workers who crowd into the mean streets of our great towns—I will not say that, if they were alive to the importance of doing so, they *could* not provide for their religious wants; but it is certain that, being what they are, they would not: and it is in the interest of the community that these wants, however elementary and inarticulate, should not be left unsupplied. The smooth Jacob, dwelling in tents, and bargaining with his God—'*if* God will give me bread to eat and raiment to put on, *then* shall the Lord be my God'—the prudential pietist of this type will never want for chaplains. It is Esau, the 'profane person,' who lacks and suffers hunger. And to-day the most important, by far the most important, function of the Christian Ministry is the Apostolate of the Indevout. This is the sufficient reason for the plant of the Church and for her endowments. As things are in this country, they are exiguous; and I do not think that they will form matter for serious controversy on either side.

IX.

With regard to the second, the last two generations have witnessed a transformation of the National Church. Sixty years ago the clergy gloried in the name of Protestant; now the majority of them would repudiate and resent it: and, were a survivor of the early Victorian period to attend a modern church service, he would find it difficult to recognize the type of worship with which he was familiar; the change is one of kind. It is not all for the worse. The old services were monotonous, and often slovenly; the Puritan theology was

even then outworn; the revolt against it was general; it was inevitable that it should disappear. The misfortune is not so much the disappearance of what was at best an *interim* theology, as its replacement by an ecclesiasticism which, where it is no more than a fashion, is meaningless; and, where it is taken seriously, represents a reaction—a falling back upon a position on the religious curve which our later world has left behind it, and to which it will not return. The result of this is that the Church of to-day is more out of touch with the average mind and conscience of the community than it was—I will not say in the time of Butler and Paley; this would be a truism—but in that of Thirlwall and Tait. It is this that makes the present movement for Disestablishment from within so mischievous. The fact that a few unwary Liberals have associated themselves with it should not blind us to its character and motives; the voice is Jacob's; and the modern Jacob, like his prototype, is 'a smooth man.' If any general interest were taken in religious questions, or if there were any general recognition of their bearing on secular life, Parliament would make short work of a proposal to destroy the national character of the Church of England and to set up a State within the State. As it is, owing to the profound indifference of the lay mind to what it regards as *querelles de sacristie*, there is a real danger of the Church being given over to a section of its members animated by sectional passion and pursuing sectional ends. Half a century ago the wisest of English bishops, Bishop Thirlwall, foresaw this.

> 'There are not a few among our own brethren who consider this liberty—that of self-government—as so desirable that, in their opinion, it outweighs all the advantages of an Establishment which, without it, are in their eyes but gilded fetters, the price of a degrading bondage. I entirely dissent from this opinion. I have no sympathy with the motives of those who hold it. I believe that the kind of liberty which they desire would be a grinding tyranny, and the worst calamity that could befall the Church.' (*Charge*, 1869.)

And, speaking of the proceedings taken at Capetown in 1863 against Bishop Colenso:

> 'There are persons who may be attracted by the spectacle now exhibited by one of our Colonial Churches, which has found itself on a sudden separated from the State, and in full enjoyment of that independence which is so much coveted by some among ourselves. I think that its example holds out a very precious and seasonable warning. The unexpected release from the 'galling fetters' and 'ignominious bondage' of the Royal Supremacy was accompanied by

> a no less complete emancipation from the rules and principles of English law and justice. The result showed how dangerous it would be to entrust a purely ecclesiastical tribunal with the administration of justice; how surely the divine would get the better of the judge . . . exercising an usurped jurisdiction by the mockery of a trial. Violence openly avowed is less pernicious than when it puts on the mask of justice, and claims the sanction of religion.' (*Charge*, 1866.)

Much that is now taking place among us gives a ring of prophecy to his words. 'It is evident,' writes a well-informed member of the newly-created National Assembly of the Church of England, that

> 'The vigour and enthusiasm of the clergy and the "practising" laity are running in a narrow channel of denominationalism. The older and larger conception of Christianity, which found expression, if a partial and hampered expression, in the system of a National Church, is neither liked nor understood. The Assembly is aflame with sectarian fervour. It has no use for the national idea and system. Secularism and Denominationalism are symptoms of one and the same disease; they play into one another's hands.'

X.

The situation, then, is entirely changed from that in which we found ourselves when the Liberation Society was a power in the Free Churches. When the *Church Times* disclaims sympathy with the Establishment, and bishops advertize their indifference to it, and 'an insolent and aggressive faction' threatens to bring the house down about our ears unless it is allowed to ride roughshod over its opponents, it is time for lovers of civil and religious liberty to reconsider the matter. For:

> *Tua res agitur cum proximus ardet*
> *Ucalegon:*

larger than merely denominational interests are at stake. A denominationalized Church would not long remain either endowed or established. But even a Disestablished Church, though it would cease, indeed, to be an intellectual force, would long remain a social and political element to be reckoned with—as the Roman Catholic Church still is in the Latin countries. And it cannot be a matter of indifference to Nonconformists that what was once the first of the Reformed Churches should abandon the principles of the Reformation. It is for no merely personal or sectarian interest that we beckon 'to our partners which are in the other ship that they should come and help us.' The difficulty—and it is not a small one—is to get them to realize the situation; if they did so, they would come.

XI.

An essential feature of an Established Church in a mixed country, like our own, is that it shall be comprehensive, and embrace all who do not insist on excluding themselves from its fold. And national, or parliamentary, control is a condition at once of this comprehensiveness, of the Establishment which postulates it, and of the advantages—they are moral very much more than material—which go with Establishment. The great, perhaps in our time the only serious, obstacle to a settlement of English religion on these lines is, not indeed Episcopacy, but *a particular theory of Episcopacy*, which, while foreign to the history, genius, and standards of the Church, is held by a restless and well organized party in the Church, and acquiesced in by many who know better, and do not themselves hold it, 'for fear of the Jews.' This is what stands in the way of reunion, or rather (to use the more correct phrase) *communicatio in sacris*, between the English Reformed Churches. Diotrephes, who 'loveth to have the pre-eminence,' bars the way. 'Neither doth he himself receive the brethren; and forbiddeth them that would; and casteth them out of the Church.' Need we fear to follow the greatest of Anglican divines, Hooker, in this matter? His argument for Episcopacy is not that it is necessary, but that it is permissible; and that, where it is by law established, the citizens need not scruple to conform. And 'happier are they whom the Lord when He cometh shall find doing in these things—judgment and mercy and fidelity—than disputing about "doctors, elders and deacons."'[8] The whole question has been discussed with characteristic vigour and incisiveness by the present Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford in his recent Bampton Lectures (1920). What is called the Apostolic Succession is, he urges, not a doctrine, but a fact resulting from the Church's practice of Episcopal ordination. As a doctrine, as it is commonly taught in the Church of England, he finds it 'mechanical and entirely unreal.'

> 'When I came to examine the doctrine historically, I was equally surprised and gratified to find how different was the more primitive teaching on the subject from that which was customary in Anglican circles. Further, I was surprised to see what little support the current form of teaching among us had from mediaeval and even modern Roman Catholic theologians. Their point of view seemed to me a

[8] *Ecclesiastical Polity.* Preface.

different one; and I began to suspect that we had here an instance of insular disproportion.'[9]

'Insular disproportion'; it is a felicitous and far-reaching phrase. How much in Neo-Anglicanism is covered by it! How many of our meaningless, but mischievous, controversies as to Scripture, the Church, the Creeds, the Sacraments, Orders, Marriage and the like would solve themselves were it borne in mind!

XII.

The co-operation for the defence of English religion which is so much to be desired is impossible without mutual understanding and sympathy. And it is, I think, impossible not to feel that such estrangement as may exist between the Church and Dissent is due rather to their political dissensions, which have been in the past great, than to their religious differences, which are trifling; that their separation rests on shadows, not on realities; on memories, not on facts. Each has something both to learn and to unlearn; the best elements on each side would be more powerful for good were they in contact with one another; their union would be their strength. The recent Lambeth Conference—in spite of the political factor in its pronouncements (whose elimination, however desirable in itself, would have split the assembly into fragments)—was a notable advance upon anything that has come from such a quarter since 1689, when Tillotson's Plan of Comprehension was wrecked upon the passions of an ungrateful clergy, whose memory for benefits was short, and for injuries long. May we not hope that the time is not far distant when Dean Stanley's noble and Christian aspiration may be realized?

'Let us trust (he wrote in 1868) that this estrangement, which has of late years greatly diminished, may altogether cease; and that we may more and more learn to treat our Dissenting brethren as our friends, our equals, and our allies—in one word, as *Nonconforming* members and ministers of the National Church.'[10]

Great would be the gain! 'They beckoned to their partners, which were in the other ship, that they should come and help them. And they came, and filled both the ships . . . And Jesus cried unto Simon, "Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men"': which the Churches, as we see them, have unfortunately to so great an extent ceased to do.

[9] *The Doctrine of the Church and Re-union*, p. 8.

[10] *Essays on Church and State*, p. 369.

THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION AND MIRACLE

By the Rev. Canon S. McComb, D.D., Professor of Pastoral Theology, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

NO apology is needed for once more raising the problem of the miraculous and its relation to Christianity. It is an old problem, but it faces us to-day with new emphasis, and clamours for a more adequate solution than any that have hitherto been offered. The Christian apologist, anxious to disengage the essential elements of the faith and commend them to the intellect of the time; the student of comparative religion, who finds wonders springing up at the feet of every great religious personality and who knows that the birth of a religion is always accompanied by an invasion of the supernatural on the natural and accustomed order; the theologian who is anxious to establish a doctrine of revelation true to history and to the nature of the human mind; the preacher who is conscious of the present perplexity of Christian thought on this subject and who feels restrained and hampered because he cannot find his way to some clear and credible view; the ordinary cultivated layman, who is troubled because the Christian religion appears to be not only supernatural in the sense of spiritual, but supernatural in the sense of being contrary to nature—all these feel the pressure of the question and are seeking for some relief. The first step in the process of clearing up our thoughts on this matter is to know exactly where we stand in regard to it to-day.

Up to within recent years, the problem was mainly philosophical or theological. The eighteenth century witnessed a kind of compromise between theology and the intellect of the age. The dominating philosophy admitted the existence of a Deity who created the world, impressed on it a rigid system of laws, and exercised over it a general non-miraculous providence. Theology, on its side, admitted the uniformity of nature, but maintained the possibility of a divine intervention or interference with this uniformity. It was Hume that destroyed this compromise. For him, miracles are logically possible, but practically impossible, because incapable of being substan-

tiated by any evidence. The question he raises is: Have there been events which we are compelled to regard as miracles, that is, as standing outside the law of causality? To this question he replies, 'No.' Human testimony is fallible and rests on conscious or unconscious deception: but natural law is not fallible; it is universally valid. Therefore it is more probable in any given case that the testimony to a miracle was false than that a violation of natural law should have been a fact. This logical puzzle has occupied the attention of agnostic and theological reasoners alike, down to our own time. Most persons will agree that Huxley gets to the heart of the matter when he says in his criticism of Hume:

> 'If a dead man did come to life, the fact would be evidence, not that any law of nature had been violated, but that those laws, even when they express the results of a very long and uniform experience, are necessarily based on incomplete knowledge, and are to be held only on grounds of more or less justifiable expectation.'

In other words, the result of the long and weary discussion inaugurated by Hume is that we are too ignorant of the ultimate laws of the universe to assert that a miracle, in apparent violation of these laws, is impossible.

In our own time, the question has entered on a new stage. One of the ruling ideas of our present way of thinking is the historical method. We are impatient of high *a priori* roads to truth. We regard the value of testimony in a way quite foreign to Hume's mode of thought. In a word, the question of miracle is being transferred from the metaphysical to the historical realm.

Before turning, however, to the historical question, let us ask: What is a miracle in the traditional sense? It may be defined as a special intervention in the ordinary course of nature, by which secondary causes are set aside by a direct volition of Deity for some special purpose. Miracles, in this sense, are necessary to revelation in order to attest the divine mission of the prophets or of Jesus Christ, and will be wrought by God with a view to the salvation of man. They were continued through the first three centuries, but then gradually came to an end, as the purpose for which they were wrought, namely, the establishment of the Christian religion, was achieved. This idea, the product of a scholastic theology, is

no longer credible to-day. In the first place, the notion is too theoretical and transcendental. It starts with the premise: God is omnipotent and can do anything, and argues therefore He has done so and so. Now, of course, the question is not: What can God do? but: What has He actually done? and this can be known only by a critical examination of history, and by the investigation of the facts of nature. In the second place, modern science has as its fundamental postulate the uniformity of law. The deepest conviction of the scientific mind is that there are no mysteries which cannot find an ultimate explanation by some law, known or unknown. It is the function of science to reduce any given phenomenon to its place as a link in a chain, or rather, as an element in an infinitely ramified network which binds it into unity with all the phenomena that precede it and that co-exist with it. Hence, Le Conte defines miracle as 'an occurrence or phenomenon according to the law higher than any we yet know.'[1] From this point of view, miracle is rather an event, the causes of which we do not know, than the result of a divine intervention. In the third place, modern theology no longer accepts the idea that the function of miracle is to attest the authenticity of a divine revelation. Here the whole stress is placed upon the element of wonder or of magic, and the inference is from a physical portent to the truth of moral and religious ideas. Matthew Arnold disposed once and for all of this scholastic notion by his famous remark: 'Suppose I could change the pen with which I write this into a pen-wiper. I should not thus make what I write any truer or more convincing.' Most thoughtful persons to-day will recognize that the criterion of any truth must be found in the truth itself. In other words, ethical truth is self-luminous. It shows its reality by its correspondence to the ethical needs of man—by the mighty changes it has wrought in the individual and in society—by the fact that in proportion as it is realized, man rises in the scale of being and of worth.

Having cleared the ground, then, of the traditional view, we are in a position to turn to the Gospel records which contain the miracle histories in which our chief interest is centred.

[1] *Evolution and Religious Thought*, p. 356.

Since the publication of Strauss' *Life of Jesus* in 1835, there has been a succession of theories seeking to show how the Gospel tradition was formed and what the sources are on which the Evangelists relied. We set aside here the Fourth Gospel, as on any hypothesis it stands by itself and cannot be taken as a primary authority for the life of Jesus. One of the indubitable results of critical inquiry has been to exalt the general historical trustworthiness of the synoptic tradition, to assure us that in this tradition we have a genuine picture of Jesus as He lived and moved among men. When due emphasis is given to this fact, it may be frankly conceded that there are a few elements in the Gospels due, no doubt, to the influence of legend, to unconscious accretion, to the ideas and preoccupations of the primitive Christian community as to what Jesus must have taught and done. The point which I desire to emphasize is that on any critical theory of the Gospels, stories of miracles enter into the earliest discoverable literary strata, and cannot be got rid of without dissolving the history into myth.

The latest criticism vindicates the remark of Theodor Keim:

> 'It is the genuine historical Jesus who is here exhibiting his compassion towards the needy, is indignant at the power of the evil one, and is constrained to put forth his healing virtue, works fundamentally by his spiritual word, and requires spiritual faith, and finally imposes silence upon those who are healed. This is a Jesus such as that sensuous, miracle-seeking age could scarcely have invented.'[2]

Let us now ask: What, according to the earliest sources, is our Lord's own attitude to miracles? We have the answer in a saying which is found in the Logia and which even Schmiedel admits to be unquestionably genuine:

> 'An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign and shall not be given to it except the sign of Jonah, for as Jonah became a sign to the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of Man be to this generation.'[3]

Christ appeals to the signs and wonders which He wrought and yet refuses to have a miracle wrung from Him by his generation, declines to pander to the crude supernaturalism which

[2] *Jesus of Nazara*, Vol. III, p. 172.
[3] See Harnack: *The Sayings of Jesus*, p. 266.

could find God only in the portents of magic. As Jonah, the preacher of repentance, was a sign to the men of Nineveh, so His preaching of the Kingdom of God was a sign to the men of Palestine. It spoke not to the childish and superstitious love of marvels, but to the intuitions of reason and of conscience. Thus it is clear that, as Auguste Sabatier says:

> 'Prodigy properly so called, is quite foreign to the wholly moral conduct of his life and to the strictly religious conception of his work. He did not found his religion on miracle, but on the light, the consolation, the pardon and the joy which his Gospel, issuing from His holy living, brought to broken and repentant souls.'[4]

So far from wishing to gain power or influence through his miracles, He forbade those who were healed to talk about the cure, and He attributed the cure not to Himself, but to the faith of the cured. On the other hand, that He wrought what were then deemed miracles is a fact based on the rock of genuine history. Christ worked miracles indeed, but only in the interests of suffering humanity and out of God-like pity. He worked no miracle that would contribute to falsity, to superstition, or to idle curiosity. It has been said—and the saying is in a sense true—that 'if all the miracles were gone the vision of Jesus would remain.[5] But would not the vision of Jesus be immeasurably impoverished if the deeds through which shine His deep compassion for the sufferings of humanity should turn out to be nothing more than a halo of glory created by the love of a later age? But these deeds of mercy are seen to be the most characteristic of Christ and the most frequent in His career. They are, at the same time, most in accord with well-known analogies in modern experience. The old view of the relation of mind and body which could permit Huxley to say that our consciousness can no more affect our physical life than a steam whistle can run a locomotive, raises a smile to-day. The history of medicine, every psychological clinic in the world, contradicts it. Every neurologist knows that in the great class of disorders where moral and psychic factors are at work, it is impossible to exaggerate the uplifting and unifying influence of personality. We have but to keep this in mind and then think of the match-

[4] *Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion*, Eng. Trans., p. 73.
[5] Gordon: *Religion and Miracle*, p. 85.

less vital endowment with which the Lord Jesus came into the world, to find the inference most credible that the unique psychical quality of that life should have unique physical and psycho-physical results. There is an indirect but weighty confirmation of this view in the fact that the influence of His personality is not portrayed as working magically or without regard to law, for it demands as the psychological medium for its healing power faith on the part of the sufferer, or of his friends, or of both.

To the same category belongs the expulsion of demons. The theologian and the student of medicine are pretty generally agreed that in every case of demon possession described in the New Testament, there is to be recognized some well-known form of nervous or mental disease. The lunatic boy at the foot of the Mount of Transfiguration presents all the symptoms of an epileptic. The demoniac of Gerasa is a sufferer from some form of mania. The 'man with an unclean spirit' in the synagogue of Capernaum reflects all the marks of a dissociated personality, such as are characteristic of acute hysteria. It was natural that in an age when the belief in demons was widespread and the science of abnormal psychology as yet unborn, people who perceived the strange and inexplicable alteration in the thought and speech and conduct of their friends should conclude that this was owing to the presence of a foreign and evil spirit. It was in dealing with these unhappy victims of mental disturbance that Jesus was especially successful, though he claimed no monopoly of the healing gift. The restoration of the diseased to their normal selves, the destruction of the evil power which enslaved them, was for Jesus a most significant sign of the presence and power of the Kingdom of God. These relative miracles, if so we may call them, are finding more and more acceptance with the most enlightened theologians of our time. Their general attitude is well summed up by Professor Wernle when he says:

> 'In the Gospels Jesus appears before us first of all as the physician of men's bodies, as the redeemer of the sick and suffering. However great the number of miraculous narratives that we set on one side as exaggerations or inventions of a later age, a nucleus of solid fact remains with which we have to deal. Jesus possessed a healing power strictly limited, it is true, by unbelief, but capable of producing the very greatest physical and psychical changes wherever

he encountered faith. This power operated especially in the case of mental diseases, but was by no means confined to them.'[6]

The so-called 'Nature Miracles' stand in a class by themselves. They are few in number, and have little or no religious significance. To use the words of Professor Sanday, 'most thoughtful Christians will accept them with a note of interrogation.' If they are to enter into our modern knowledge. they must be conceived of in terms of our modern consciousness, and it may be that it is reserved for still further study to discover the substantial kernel of fact which lies within the shell of the narratives as they have come down to us. The most important of the 'Nature Miracles' is the Feeding of the Five Thousand. It may be that the explanation of this wonder is to be found in the outburst of brotherly generosity provoked by the example of Jesus, so that each was able to share in the others' good. Or it may be that, as Dr. Schweitzer has recently explained, Jesus used the food which He and His disciples had brought with them, as the elements of a sacramental, Messianic meal, so that every one received a little after He had pronounced a blessing. This explanation finds some support in the Messianic prophecy of the Old Testament of a feast or banquet which should be one of the accompaniments of the Messianic Kingdom. There are some who will object: In thus relating miracle to the idea of law, does not the essence of the matter evaporate? Is not the raison d'être of a miracle its quality as evidence of God's personal care for the individual? And if the upshot of the discussion is simply to leave us face to face with a network of laws, have we not lost something which our fathers had—a proof of the presence and power of a personal God in the world? This is a feeling which disturbs earnest minds at the present time, and it springs out of a truly religious consciousness. The religious man feels that his relations with God must be vital, personal, direct; and in certain moods his imagination conceives of nature rather as a mask which conceals Deity than as an interpreter that reveals Him. Let us try to grapple with this difficulty. Suppose we could establish upon the most irrefragible basis the few nature-miracles recorded in the Gospels: how could they

[6] *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. I (Eng. Trans.), p. 97.

help us to face those stretches of history and of our own experience where the reign of law is absolute and inviolable? The apparent indifference of nature to man's welfare is the standing rebuke administered by scepticism to the claims of faith. Whatever may have happened in the first century in Galilee, we know, alas, that here and now the pestilence walks at noonday; the earthquake sweeps to the same dreadful end the just and the unjust; the ship foundering on the sunken rock goes down into the swirling waters which drown alike the cries of innocence and of guilt. Such facts are among the difficulties of faith: but the answer to them cannot be found in the events of a far-distant past.

Still further; the objection involves a dualism which thought is ever striving to overcome. What are the laws of nature from a theistic standpoint but simply the rational principles by which God administers the world? The whole course of nature, as Lotze reminds us, becomes intelligible only by supposing the continual co-activity of God, who mediates the action and reaction going on between atom and atom, element and element. The laws or principles of the divine action appear to operate uniformly, and thus exclude the notions of irrationality, caprice or favouritism. In other words, within the limits of time and space, as a mortal being the individual is cared for, but not, it would seem, in a way which would be out of relation to the government of the world as a whole. Civilisation, culture, all the highest fruits of human activity, would be impossible without a stable universe; and the pains and accidents which nature inflicts on man are thus the price he pays for this stability. If, indeed, the nature and activity of God were exhausted in His legislation for the physical universe, there would be room for despair, for then nature might well present the aspect of a dark and pitiless fate. But it is one of the great truths of religion that beyond the sphere of the exactitudes of natural law there is an infinite region of spirit and freedom where all souls can meet in personal and unimpeded fellowship with the Father of spirits.

MODERNISM AND THE BIBLE

By the Rev. Francis E. Powell, Rector of Ladbroke, Co-Editor of *The Hebrew Prophets for English Readers.*

I. *The Permanent Value of the Bible.*

1. In this Book there is more that *finds* me than I have experienced in all other books put together. Here I have met everywhere, more or less, copious sources of truth, and power, and purifying impulses. Here I have found words for my inmost thoughts, songs for my joy, utterances for my hidden griefs, and pleadings for my shame and for my feebleness.

S. T. Coleridge.

2. Neither vision nor ecstasy, neither voice from heaven nor bodeful dream, has pointed the way of Salvation to me. I owe my enlightenment quite simply to the reading of a book . . . The Book, the Bible . . . He who has lost his God may find Him again in this volume, and he who has never known His will, will there be met by the breath of the Divine word.

Heinrich Heine.

3. As long as the world lasts all who want to make progress in righteousness will come to Israel for inspiration, as the people who have had the sense of righteousness most glowing and strongest, and in hearing and reading the words Israel has uttered for us, carers for conduct will find a glow and a force they could find nowhere else. Matthew Arnold.

4. The Bible may be regarded as the depository of human experience, and therefore as so fully interpreting ourselves to ourselves that we attribute to the written words some mystic divine authority. If what the Bible says fails to lay hold of mind and heart, no amount of coercive authority could give it a place in such a man's life, for such authority and religion are mutually exclusive. Ten Broeke.

5. When people hear the Commandments recited numbers believe that the preamble, 'God spake these words and said,' represents an articulate utterance made to Moses from the Unseen. It is hard for them to understand that all the talking on this planet has been by man and, of course, woman, and

that the universe, which does everything, says nothing. And where historical fact is dealt with in the Bible it is extremely difficult for the popular mind, educated as it has been, to comprehend that in the majority of instances what is offered to us is fact plus Oriental imagination. J. Brierley.

6. Myth and legend and story have been instruments in the Divine educating of men as well as strict history.

Bishop C. Gore.

7. The Priestly Code views everything from the priest's standpoint . . . and . . . thus cuts across plain facts of history. It is wholly based on theocratic motives and ideals, and throws back its own ideals into a remote past. Its symbolical ideas are transformed into tangible history, simply because its authors honestly believed that what is done, and ought to be done, in their day, was always done by true Israelites in all ages. J. R. Cohu.

8. We read the Bible now, not as the record of a revelation springing fully armed into human life, but as the record of the way in which, under the Divine guidance, men 'creep ever on from fancies to the fact.' In theological language, we recognize the progressive method of the teaching of the Holy Spirit.

J. H. Masterman.

9. No book is perfect. Could one not tell children that as our language has had a history, so our goodness and our ideas about right and wrong have had a history, and that God teaches us slowly and by degrees, and that our great-grandchildren will know more than we know ourselves, or, at all events, will know differently? We believe in the gradual education of the human race. C. G. Montefiore.

10. By the study of what other book could children be so humanized and made to feel that each figure in the vast historical procession fills, like themselves, but a momentary space in the interval between two eternities and earns the blessings or the curses of all time according to its effort to do good and hate evil? The pagan moralists lack fire and colour, and even the noble stoic, Marcus Aurelius, is too high and refined for an ordinary child. T. H. Huxley.

11. The Bible is the record of man's search for God as well as of God's search for man. It is not so much God teaching

us history as history teaching us about God. We should regard it not as a quarry from which to excavate dogmas, but as a well from which to draw spiritual truth. Its real value depends upon the fact that it is a record of ancient religious experience making its irresistible appeal to man's heart and conscience. We must interpret it along the line of its leading eternal and universal ideas and not of its local and temporary accompaniments, and thus see its moral and spiritual teaching dismembered of faulty history, of imperfect science, and of the swaddling-clothes of myth and legend. We must distinguish between the shell and the pearl, the jewel and its casket, between the earthen vessel and the treasure it holds, between the letter and the spirit, between that which is of time and of earth and that which is of heaven and eternity. F. E. Powell.

12. If you read the Bible foolishly you can gather all sorts of contradictory teaching from its pages; for the Bible is no formal system with every precept accurately defined and limited, and every exception carefully pointed out. It deals with broad principles rather than with particular precepts; these we are trusted to apply ourselves to the practical guiding of our lives. Sometimes its commands are of universal application; sometimes they apply only to such special cases as are before the writer; sometimes they are figurative and intended to prescribe the spirit and temper of our lives. There is the thoughtless habit of quoting all parts of the Bible as Scripture, whether they be the words of our Lord, or those of Bildad or Zophar. There is the habit of twisting the obvious meaning of words, or of quoting, for the support of doctrines, isolated texts, regardless of the context or of the circumstances in which they were orignally uttered. From 'Dummelow's Commentary.'

13. If a man will not feed on the good meat of the Word, let him not marvel if he be choked with the dry bones.

Thomas Fuller (17th Century).

II. *Modern Views on the Bible.*

1. The Bible is a revelation of God by being, in the first place, so deep and searching a revelation of man. It is the story of man's quest for God, and of God's answer to the quest; of God revealing Himself in human souls; in different ages,

and on different levels; the light shining ever more clearly upon the human vision as it was able to receive it, until in that wondrous life and death which the New Testament enshrines we find the Divinest sign which the heavens and the earth have yet disclosed to us, the sign in which we read the inmost heart of Deity. J. Brierley.

2. The 'Ten Words,' as originally promulgated, consists only of the commands such as we find them in the case of the Sixth to the Ninth Commandments, all beyond in the others being of the nature of later comments and additions and, fortunately in the case of the Fourth, we have the earlier Deuteronomic commentary (Deut. v, 14, 15) . . . The time has come when its misleading Priestly comment should no longer be repeated at our altars. It should be either dropped altogether, or the Deuteronomic comment substituted for it.

H. Dukinfield Astley.

3. Our childhood was reared in a doctrine of the Bible which declared it to be, from beginning to end, an infallible record, every word supernaturally dictated, every statement of it on the same level of truth and holiness . . . Since Astruc, the French physician, discovered (1753) the varied sources of the Genesis narrative, the Book has been telling us its own story; . . . the contributions of the Elohist and the Jehovist, so different in style, in point of view; the later work of the Deuteronomist, and the Priestly revisions of the post-exilic period. We have the evidence of *Judges* lying over against the idealist creations of *Leviticus* and *Numbers*; the sober accounts of *Kings* as against the exaggerations of *Chronicles*. In these differences and contradictions; in this placing, side by side, of vastly varying moral levels, and of the sentiments which arise out of them; in the whole vast accumulation of facts concerning itself which it offers, the Book exhibits its real character; shows itself as the Book of God and man; of God lifting man from stage to stage of character, of insight; of man, opening his mind and soul to this gracious education, expressing in a myriad varied ways the truth which he has reached, the strength which has come to him. J. Brierley.

4. A fiction, which is true to human experience, may be as rich in spiritual meaning as a literary history. F. W. Farrar.

5. Inspiration is never represented in Scripture as verbal dictation where human powers and limitations are suspended, so that like a phonographic plate the result is a mechanical reproduction of the words of God. Rather, God spoke to men through their experience as they were able to understand Him, and as a result the Great Book, like a true Christian man, represents alike the inbreathing of the Divine and the limitation of the human. DR. H. E. FOSDICK.

6. The O.T. embodies many conceptions of God, of the world unseen, of worship, and of duty, which so far from being due to revelation, are exactly the conceptions from which it is the work of revelation to deliver us. Whatever in the O.T. is contrary to the mind of Christ is false. It may have had a necessary place on the road to truth, but it is not itself true.
H. L. GOUDGE.

7. From the moment that the Jewish Scriptures became known to the Greeks the sacred volume could not but take its place as a compendium of the history of the world. With all the exclusiveness of Jewish nationality, the O.T. yet presented what no other book had yet done—the families of the earth looking back to a past and forward to a future which made them aware of the unity of their destinies. MARK PATTISON.

8. Religion, together with the ideal of life arising out of it, changes greatly in the course of the Bible. First, there is the national Deity of Israel, who instigates to the slaughter of other nations; then, the universal God of Righteousness, who judges impartially the peoples of the world, and demands obedience to law; and, thirdly, the Loving Father in heaven, who calls all men individually to salvation that is not of this world, and requires that they should love one another.
F. A. M. SPENCER.

9. A perfect revelation bestowed upon imperfect minds would be about as useful and sensible as the recital of a table of logarithms to an infant in arms. WARSCHAUER.

10. The religion taught in the Bible is all one and the same, only in the sense that the acorn and the oak are one and the same, only in the sense that the unformed and immature mind of the child, and the well-balanced mind and wisdom of the grown man, are one and the same. The Bible is a panorama of religious progress. MAYNE YOUNG.

III. *Obsolete views on the Bible.*

1. From the fourth to the fifteenth century, the Church strove to suppress the novel theory that the earth is spherical and not flat; and Columbus, when he was planning to sail round the world, was confronted with a long array of proof-texts from the Fathers to prove the impiety of such an attempt. Or again, when some bold astronomers in the sixteenth century dared to suggest that the earth is not the centre of the Universe, all Christendom was scandalised; and Martin Luther and the Papal authorities agreed for once, that the new theory was unscriptural and profane. PROF. BONNEY.

2. The idea that prophecy is 'history written beforehand' (Bishop Butler) is radically false; it is a survival from an age in which the prophets were not studied in the light of history, and is a source of many and serious misunderstandings of their meaning. DR. S. R. DRIVER.

3 The Bible can no longer be regarded as the miraculous exponent of a dogmatic revelation. J. DRUMMOND.

4. It is impossible to take an isolated saying of our Lord, whether on marriage, or oaths, or poverty, or non-resistance, to remove it from the living stream of His thought, to petrify it, and make it the corner-stone of a dogmatic construction. Such an exegesis is fantastic; it misunderstands and misinterprets the text. Thus theologians defended persecution, the Divine right of kings, slavery, the belief in witchcraft. The letter lent itself to these superstitions; the spirit broke away from them; and the growing consciousness of mankind passed them by. A. FAWKES.

5. How many of that large class, in some respects the most important in the community, the half-educated, pass easily from the repulsion inspired by the imperfectly moralized Deity of the O.T. to the rejection of the Father-God of the N.T. A. FAWKES.

6. Has not the 'undivided Church' guaranteed the historicity of the O.T. and the dogma of Biblical infallibility as strongly as it has guaranteed the truth of any N.T. miracle? . . . Once deny the truth of one part of the Bible, and you have no reason for believing the rest; that was the unanimous attitude of Protestants and Catholics alike. And the great majority of ignorant Christians would say so now. . . . Surely

the only reason why Biblical infallibility was not made an article of the Creed was that no Christian thought of disputing it. DEAN RASHDALL.

IV. *Modern Biblical Criticism.*

1. We have to apply to all the books of the Bible and to all the narratives they contain the principles that we follow in all other historical and literary studies. DR. BETHUNE BAKER.

2. *Lower criticism* seeks to investigate by comparison of manuscripts, quotations, versions, conjecture, &c., the original form of the text of any book. *Higher criticism* seeks to investigate the *genuineness* (*i.e.*, the authorship) of the book in question, its date, unity, locality, original language, &c. *Historical criticism*, which is often included under *higher criticism*, seeks to investigate how far the book in question is authentic, *i.e.*, how far what it relates can be regarded as historical or scientific fact. H. D. A. MAJOR.

3. Higher criticism is the ability to distinguish between great spiritual ideas, and the drapery of legend, myth and parable in which they are clothed, and what people, destitute of imagination and without knowledge of Oriental methods, have too often mistaken for history. ANON.

V. *The necessity of Biblical Criticism.*

1. Why do we smile when that famous humanist and pioneer Hebraist, Reuchlin, educes the doctrine of the Trinity from Gen. I, i, *Bereshith bara Elohim*, by taking the word *bara* acrostically: Abba, Ruach, Ben: Father, Spirit, Son? Why smile when Luther tells us that Adam and Eve entered the Garden at noon and the Fall occurred about 2 p.m.? Or, again, when Dr. Martin tells us that Copernicus is an insolent astrologer, who upsets the whole biblical account of things? Why smile when we hear that learned rabbinical scholar of the seventeenth century, Dr. John Lightfoot, declaring that creation took place in an instant of time, on October 23rd, 4004 B.C., at 9 a.m. Or when we read in the *Helvetic Formula Consensus* of 1675 that even the very vowel points of the Massoretic text were inspired—unaware, as they were, that the vowel points were a post-Talmudic invention, not earlier than 600 A.D., at

which time, according to their hypothesis, inspiration had long since ceased? Why smile when we hear of John Wesley exclaiming that to give up witchcraft is in effect to give up the Bible? Or when Dr. Dodge declared that the theory of evolution is 'atheism,' and 'utterly inconsistent with the Scriptures?' Why smile, indeed, if we are in fundamentally the same situation? *The Biblical World.*

2. Since to the bulk of mankind science and history are somewhat remote and indifferent things, while experience, emotion, conduct make up the substance of their lives, the historic criticism of the Bible, which seems to be destructive in tendency and to introduce difficulties in the way of faith, is repulsive. The ordinary Christian need not greatly trouble himself about it. Only he goes wrong when he regards historic criticism as the outgrowth of intellectual pride, or as showing an un-Christian disposition. If the religious man regards science as hostile, scientists and historians will regard religion as mere obscuranticism and falsehood. We have to adjust the claims of history with those of the Christian Ideal and Hope.

P. Gardner.

3. I can only say that the confidence which I believe we may feel in the truth of the Gospel depends upon the courage of our criticism of the Gospels. . . . Reason essentially demands that historical criticism shall apply itself with equal and full freedom to every document. . . . But it must be very careful that *praejudicia*, whether ecclesiastical or rationalistic, are not arbitrary. Bishop C. Gore.

4. Even the Gospels according to Matthew and Luke give us an interpretation of Jesus Christ's life. An interpretation may be helpful, illuminating, even inspired, but it remains an interpretation. The thing which actually occurred was the life which Jesus lived, and our chief authority for the facts of that life is the Gospel according to Mark. We must be prepared resolutely to hold fast by the result we have attained. Ideas may develop, interpretations may become more noble and more profound, but the facts of ancient history do not develop. They remain the same. We must resist the temptation to try and fit into the historical framework supplied by Mark all the tales and sayings of Christ that we find in the other Gospels.

We must beware of regarding as additions to the sacred Biography things that are in reality interpretations of it.

PROF. F. C. BURKITT.

5. The days are passed when the Church was stirred to its foundation by the pronouncement of that great arithmetician, Bishop Colenso, and his sceptical Zulu, as to the numbers in the Pentateuch, or when Dr. Liddon sank 'wounded in the house of his friends' by the liberal views on Ps. cx, which emanated from Pusey House. DR. FOAKES-JACKSON.

6. Behind the first three Gospels is a document which is almost, if not entirely, identical with our 'Mark,' so that in the passages in which we have the same story in them, Mark must in the main be taken as the original, and the other two gospels as the earliest commentaries on Mark. Behind Matthew and Luke, in passages where they do not cover the same ground as Mark, there is also a common source (generally known as Quelle = source) which is very early. We do not know whether this is always the same document, or whether many or few sections in Matthew or Luke, with no parallels, do not come really from Q. No serious critics suggest that Q and Mark represent the whole truth, but that the historian must . . . treat them as the earliest and best authorities for any attempt to reconstruct the life of Jesus.

DR. KIRSOPP LAKE.

7. The principles which some of us advocated thirty years ago, and on account of which we were denounced as 'unsound,' and our lectures labelled 'dangerous,' have now been generally adopted in the teaching of the Universities, both in Great Britain and America. The 'New Learning' has triumphed.

BISHOP H. E. RYLE.

8. A fire once swept over an ancient land, destroying the flowers and foliage and changing the familiar aspect of the scene. But as people were grieving for their loss they discovered that the destroying fire had opened by its heat deep fissures in the rocks, disclosing rich veins of silver. So shall it be with us if we face the new questions wisely. If by the searching fire of literary and scientific criticism we lose some cherished traditional notions, we shall gain in a deeper knowledge of truth. From 'Dummelow's Commentary.'

BOOK NOTICES

THE DIVINE INITIATIVE.*

The Publications Department of the Student Christian Movement has done well to ask Dr. H. R. Mackintosh to issue in book form the four lectures bearing the above title originally delivered by him at a school for missionaries on furlough during last year. Having read the book, one is left with a clear impression of its central thought. 'All that Christians are they owe to the spontaneous love of God.' That, in a single sentence, is the lecturer's theme. Man's need of God, whether adequately recognised or not, is clear and indisputable. Man, even at his worst, is 'God's fallen kinsman.' The need of God is exemplified in at least three ways. Man craves a fuller and more abundant life; he demands the power to escape from the suffering and transience of earthly existence; he looks for deliverance from moral despair. Only God—personal, Christ-like, satisfying positively the human demand for fellowship with the Divine—can meet the claim.

And God is acting continuously for that claim's satisfaction, offering through Christ life, comradeship, the assurance of immortality, forgiveness, power. Everywhere the initiative is God's. We see this truth proclaimed in the phenomenon of the Prophet's 'call,' in the fact of revelation, in the very principle of an Incarnation, and in the experience of every converted man and woman, apprehended of God, driven, as it were, into new paths by the over-mastering urgency of divine love. Not, of course, that human co-operation can be ruled out. Man must respond, but God in every case is the great Initiator. Many who recognise the truth that the Christian life is a struggle, a conflict, an unceasing and relentless warfare against evil, have yet failed to grasp the greater truth that faith, defined as 'the obedient and grateful apprehension of God in Christ,' is the essential and dominating characteristic of the Christian attitude.

Such faith is the response of the whole man to something that God has done. The argument 'Because I need God, therefore God exists' is treated, we venture to think, with undue contempt. The lecturer knows that this argument can be used against the Christian position by those who assume that 'God' is nothing more than the product of human desire. A hungry man, we are told, desires food, but that does not in the least prove that food is available. So a man may desire God, but his desire is in itself no proof of Divine reality. We submit that the analogy is false. Hunger proves that somewhere food is obtainable. The need is evidence of its potential satisfaction. In the same way a man may be hungry for God, dissatisfied with the idea of God presented to him, and here, too, hunger and dissatisfaction are a guarantee that a truer and more satisfying conception of God is ultimately obtainable. The argument from man's desire for God is much stronger in the hands of the theist than when used against him.

At the same time it is of course true that the element of human discovery can be over-stressed. 'You cannot adequately describe Jesus by calling Him the hard-won result of our search for God; He is God Himself come forth to search for us and to find us.' That is admirably said, and the conviction which prompts the words must ever be the driving power of Christian missionary activity. In Christ God has acted; in

* *The Divine Initiative*, by Dr. H. R. Mackintosh. S.C.M., 1921. Price 3/6 net (paper cover, 2/6).

Christ God's portrait is revealed. You either know of that action or you do not; you have either seen that portrait or you have not. And for those who have seen, silence is impossible. 'Christianity has in its veins the life-blood of fact. Hence the disciple of Christ can stand up and proclaim not simply what he feels, but what God has done.'

This same sensitiveness to the truth of the Divine initiative leads Dr. Mackintosh to attack the tendency to Pelagianism which he detects in modern life. Pelagius, he tells us, proclaimed every man his own saviour, and with such a proclamation the Church rightly enough would have nothing to do. We believe, however, that in nearly every one there is a latent sympathy with this particular heretic. When you have said all that can be said of the Divine initiative, most people have still the feeling: 'Well, for all that, God and I working together have made me.' It is not meant of course that Dr. Mackintosh would deny this essentially Pauline conviction; but while it is true that apart from God in Christ we can do nothing, it is no less true that man *qua* man is, by the very constitution of his being, in potential partnership with God. Without such partnership, conscious or implicit, man would not be human, and unless this truth is emphasised, the impression that God does, or at least *may*, act in an arbitrary and external manner, is unavoidable. The semi-Pelagianism of the modern man is frequently a not altogether unhealthy reaction from the tendency of theologians of an earlier age to reduce man 'for theological purposes to his lowest terms.'

Once more the emphasis on a God who has done something in and through Christ leads the lecturer to an attack on mysticism as anti-social and tending to minimise the centrality of the historic Jesus. That such tendencies do reveal themselves in the writings of the more negative mystics is of course undeniable. But it would not be true to say that Christian mysticism as such either reduces the paramount importance of Christ or that it is anti-social. At its highest the thought of the Christian mystic is both Christo-centric and essentially alive to the full social implications of the Christian faith. Quakerism, for instance, the most notable experiment in 'organised mysticism,' has proved conclusively, and for a sufficiently long period, that the sweeping indictment: 'Anti-social, Christ-ignoring' is unwarranted. The spirit of fellowship, the ascendency of the Christ, the essentially social character of Christianity—all these have received, and receive to-day, full recognition at the hands of the true mystic.

Of the Church as an integral part of Christianity Dr. Mackintosh speaks with admirable force and conviction. Desert island Christianity he regards as a contradiction in terms. The Christian character presupposes at every turn the Christian society for its maturing and exercise. Apart from the Church, conceived as the fellowship of believing people, Christian truth cannot be known and grasped in its entirety. Apart from the Church, constituted as it is for the most part of families who practise among their members the habit of forgiveness, the stupendous fact of a forgiving God cannot come home to the individual with full urgency and power of conviction. Apart from the Church the nature and work of the Holy Spirit, whose office it is to redeem human society and to establish a kingdom, cannot receive adequate realisation. Finally, apart from the Church, considered as God's family, belief in immortality is robbed of its intensest joy. The fellowship of the Church here is an earnest of fuller, deeper, more intimate fellowship in the coming age.

Man's need of God, the Divine response to and satisfaction of that need, the nature of human co-operation, the characteristics of appre-

hending faith, the vision of human society as a fellowship for the expression of the Christ spirit—here are great themes greatly handled. We commend this book whole-heartedly to the careful consideration of all who desire to grasp anew the grandly simple essentials of the Christian faith.

W. Maurice Pryke.

THE SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF CHRISTIANITY.*

This book is important because its author, unlike so many who undertake to write on Christianity and social questions, has a thorough knowledge of both parts of his subject. Mr. Lee on the one hand is a man of business, who knows from the inside the practical difficulties and varied problems of business life, while on the other hand he is a man who sees in Christianity not an extra, not a superficial adornment, not a luxury for the temperamentally devout, but a dynamic spiritual principle affecting profoundly every human relationship from the simplest to the most complex. Important as was the pronouncement of the Lambeth Conference on social and industrial questions, the fact that it was issued by a body of bishops would deprive it for many of its full effect. The significance of the present book is that the usual taunt of unpractical idealism here falls to the ground. As the Bishop of Lichfield writes at the conclusion of a short preface, 'the whole book is an excellent commentary on the declaration of the Bishops in 1920: "We desire to emphasize our conviction that the pursuit of mere self-interest, whether individual or corporate, will never bring healing to the wounds of society. . . . Our only hope lies in reverent allegiance to the Person of Christ, whose Law is the Law of Love, in acceptance of His principles, and reliance on His power."' Where a prophetic faith in a great ideal is united with a full and detailed knowledge of actual facts, which are in seeming conflict with that ideal's realisation, men will listen with eagerness to the prophet's words.

Mr. Lee is quite sure that Christianity has within it the power to transform social and industrial relationships. He complains, like many others, that 'the relationship of the individual Christian to the outer world has been ill-defined, and does not seem to have demanded any type of action which might identify him as a Christian.' While it is stated emphatically that the Church may not claim any one type of social order, whether individualistic, socialistic, or otherwise, as specifically and exclusively Christian, yet it is contended that manifestly the follower of Christ can never be indifferent to the form of social structure. While man is not to be regarded as solely the product of his environment, it yet remains true that 'without a reasonable environment there are pitiable limits to the development of character.'

The inadequacy of reform by legislation alone is clearly recognised, and emphasis laid on change of heart, increased sensitiveness in face of social abuses, revolution in motives rather than in forms of government, as the supreme factors in any true reconstruction of the social order. At the same time Mr. Lee has no patience with the comfortable Christian who makes the so-called inwardness of Christianity an excuse for a reactionary policy towards social and industrial questions. 'It is unfortunate,' he writes, 'that when the necessity of changes from within is emphasized it should seem to indicate that there is no pressing necessity for any visible change. It is plausible to discount the importance of environment, but it is less impressive in the mouths of those whose lots

* *The Social Implications of Christianity*. By John Lee, M.A., M.Com.Sc. (Student Christian Movement, 1922. Price 4/6 net.)

have fallen in pleasant places, and who enjoy a goodly heritage. It is well to learn a scorn of the world, its possessions and its honours, but it is not impressive to have it suggested as a substitute for possessions and honours, and those who would seek substitutes in the unseen world for such favours may well wonder why the competition for the spiritual and superior possessions is less stern than it is for the material and inferior possessions.'

With the present conditions of industry Mr. Lee is profoundly dissatisfied. He commits himself to the disquieting statement that to-day 'our industrial relationships suggest the Divorce Court rather than the sacrament of marriage,' adding the significant comment that the marriage service gives us an admirable definition of the ideal industrial relationship, 'for the mutual society, help, and comfort, that the one ought to have of the other, both in prosperity and adversity.' While our author's temper is as far as possible from that of the violent partisan, he is yet fully awake to the black record of employers in the past, and clearly regards that record as in the main responsible for the present antagonism between Labour and Capital. 'What seems to have happened is that, under the stress of acquisitiveness which has seized the governing classes, those of other social grades have come to be imitative, and material possessions, and the flaunting of material possessions, and the desire of material possessions, have come to be the end and inspiration of life. . . . The captains of industry have had a long opportunity, and it is not uncharitable to say that in the main they have failed.'

The chapter on the meaning of Christian worship is one of the most illuminating in the book. So much which passes for worship is branded as unreal, as on a par with a fashionable wedding, as a conventional recognition of God without the consecration of human relationships. It is precisely this consecration of human relationships which forms, in the writer's opinion, the vital element of all true worship. The worshipper presents himself and his goods to God for God's disposal. And the thought of the Brotherhood is never absent. 'Worship involves the denial not of personal possessions, but of possession for use solely from the personal point of view.' The divorce of true worship from life is unthinkable. Hard thinking, honest self-questioning, complete self-dedication, the aspiration to co-operate with the Divine purposes—all these are involved in true worship, and it may be that 'Society is to be saved not by the force of revolutionaries, or by the thunders of fierce critics, or by systems which will overthrow all that has evolved from the past, but by the quiet unseen process of the sanctuary.'

Of Christian leadership in the spirit of sacrifice and service, of that Christian renunciation which reconciles the seemingly antagonistic ideals of self-denial and self-development in the higher synthesis of self-dedication to the cause of God and humanity, of the redemption of Society through the recognition on the part of Christ's followers that both the Incarnation and the Atonement have an intimate bearing upon all human relationships, Mr. Lee has much to say that is well worth attention. He would have us recognise that rightly understood the Christian faith 'is no narrow, spiritual cult, heedless of material well-being. It has no unconsidered margins, for it takes into account all that man can be, and would fain consecrate his every thought and word and act. In this unique fusion of all men together . . . and in this conception of a spiritual kingdom underlying all the relationships of men, we find the social implications of Christianity.'

W.M.P.

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.*

Mr. Graham Wallas has recently predicted, not perhaps without a hint of satisfaction, the earthquake effects of the New Psychology upon Christian orthodoxy. He expatiates *more suo* upon the Church's unwillingness to welcome truth, and asserts that the problem of relating new psychological knowledge to old religious convictions will prove more complex than any other problem with which the Church has yet been confronted. We need not call in question his assertions nor quarrel with his unflattering estimate of the ecclesiastical mind. But some are learning that earthquakes of the variety predicted by Mr. Wallas are by no means always barren of beneficent results. By this time we are familiar enough with the prophet of doom. The discoveries of Natural Science, the rise of Old Testament criticism, the adoption of the same critical methods in the study of the Gospels—all alike were thought by many to spell the virtual overthrow of the Christian faith. In each case, however, the prophets of doom have been discomfited by the facts. The game of prediction is a game at which two can play, and, playing the prophet in our turn, we confidently predict that Mr. Wallas is destined to share the discomfiture of his predecessors.

In his all too short volume on *Psychology and the Christian Life,* Mr. T. W. Pym has taken the right course and boldly proclaimed an alliance between the New Psychology and the Old Religion. For him earthquakes have no terrors. With the instinct of the true psychologist he wins us to his side at the outset, and inspires our confidence both in him and in ourselves, by his assurance that 'Psychology is the one branch of science within the understanding of the ordinary man.' Recollections of a terminology alarmingly technical are thereby relegated to the margin of consciousness, and we forthwith address ourselves, with the gratifying sense that our ability as ordinary people has for once at least received the recognition it deserves, to the pleasing task of testing for ourselves Mr. Pym's comforting assertion.

It is well to say at once that as far as this book is concerned its author's statement is fully justified. What Mr. Pym has to tell us is essentially within the understanding of the ordinary man. He avoids with marked success the horrifying jargon of more imposing volumes, opens for us avenues of approach to big subjects, makes us feel that these subjects are emphatically worth our consideration, and assures us that, given sincerity of purpose, we need not lose ourselves in the apparently maze-like realms of the new science. After all, as he himself would have us understand, Psychology is largely a matter of common sense, and in the study of Psychology 'every man is his own laboratory.'

It is fully evident that the world uses Psychology already, and the Church must not lag behind. The advertisement agent, the educationalist, the doctor—all are psychologists in their degree, inasmuch as all recognise the truth of the dictum 'The proper study of Mankind is Man.' If the three primary instincts of Self, Sex, and Herd are at the basis, so to speak, of every human personality, then it is clearly of importance to study intelligently the consequences issuing from the presence of these instincts within us, to insure that as far as possible each instinct shall play its true part in a life of harmonious purpose, and above all, to consider to what extent and by what means God has chosen to work through these primary instincts for the accomplishment of His purposes both in the individual and in the community as a whole.

* *Psychology and the Christian Life,* by T. W. Pym, D.S.O., M.A. S.C.M., 1921. Price 4/- net (paper covers, 2/6 net).

Obviously in themselves the primary instincts are non-moral. The moral element enters in with the question of their due co-ordination and proper exercise. Thus temptation is the suggestion that one instinct be allowed a disproportionate domination and a channel of expression leading to unsocial ends. Sin, on this view, may be thought of as the acknowledgment of such a suggestion and the attempt to give it practical effect. Remorse, again, is due to a felt lack of harmony in the personality of the sinner, while through repentance, confession and the assurance of forgiveness the sense of burden may be removed, harmony restored and latent energy released. It is all common sense, and essentially in line with recorded Christian experience.

Of course the hypothesis of the sub-conscious mind is accepted, and not the least interesting feature of the book is the suggestion as to the method whereby ideas efficient for the increase of vitality whether in mind or body may be introduced into the sub-conscious mind by a process of auto-suggestion similar in many respects to the established practice of Christian meditation.

The chapters which deal with the Psychology of Jesus both as a teacher and as a healer of disease, are extremely valuable and suggestive. If they propound more problems than they solve, that is only what a book written in the spirit of the Christian pioneer might be expected to do. As Mr. Pym points out, the temptations of Jesus came to Him through the three great primary instincts, and His method of dealing with them is important as showing the value of counter-suggestion in face of the evil impulse. A study of Jn. xii, 27 f., as the verses are rendered in Moffatt's translation, supplies an illuminating example. The emphasis on faith, both in the teaching and practice of Jesus, is entirely in line with the convictions of modern psychologists as to faith's efficacy and curative effects. It is now generally recognised that the miracles of healing are no longer the stumbling-blocks in the path of the liberal theologian that once they were. Many 'miracles' can be and are repeated at the present day, and those works of Jesus which no science of psycho-therapy is as yet able to emulate seem to be at least such as might be expected of one whose personality was wholly uninfluenced by the weakening effect of sin.

In a final chapter the author throws out illuminating suggestions as to the value of psychological study for the minister of religion, and intimates ways in which Psychology may help us to understand the religious needs of the average churchgoer, and the social demands of those who in their environment and consequent outlook differ more or less markedly from ourselves. The book is emphatically one to buy, and to read more than once. That a second edition was called for within a few months of publication may be regarded as corroborative evidence in favour of the author's thesis that because the average man is a person of common sense he is also, potentially at least, a student of the New Psychology.

W. Maurice Pryke.

TWO AMERICAN BOOKS ON MODERNISM.[1]

Dr. Sterrett, the writer of a significant essay, *Modernism in Religion*, tells us that he is 'a convinced Modernist in religion'; but, like many another Modernist, he was not always so, but began 'very much as Tyrrells says he did—as a conservative,' who 'slaughtered the exponents of the higher criticism.' Yet in the end this traditional apologist found that he had learned much from the enemy. His rejection of the older apolo-

[1] *Modernism in Religion.* By the Rev. J. Macbride Sterrett. (The Macmillan Co. $1.50.)
Modernism and the Christian Faith. By Prof. J. A. Faulkner. (Allen & Unwin. 12/6 net.)

getic, however, did not reduce him to pessimism about religion, or to a repudiation of the Church. On the contrary, American Modernists have continued to base themselves upon the axiom of the Church's necessity and value. 'Their aim is to help Modernists who are within, and the many who are now outside, the Church, and also to help the Church to help them' (p. 9).

The American public has coined a fairly vigorous language for itself in the spheres of commerce and sport, and has been hardly less picturesque in its characterization of certain types of theology; it has these 'canned goods' correctly estimated, and is asking the Church 'to give them the Christ of the Gospels and His living message, and that message in language "understanded of the people" of this age' (p. 10).

It is singularly unfortunate that so few of its opponents take the trouble to understand Modernism, which they persist in regarding as a theological *system*. Modernism, according to Pius X (and those Anglican authorities who like to feel they are exercising a papal prerogative) is 'the synthesis of all the heresies.' Sabatier, on the other hand, who is in a better position to understand what it is, tells us that 'Modernism is not a new system or a new synthesis: it is an orientation.' Better even than this definition is Dr. Sterrett's remark that 'Modernism stands for a new spirit and new methods in the study and teaching of religion and ethics' (p. 16), and that it is 'a vitalising spirit making all things new, and an intellectual method rather than a formulated creed.'

No doubt this is a conception which those who are cursed with the gift of the literal mind find it very difficult to grasp, and we admit that every man must think after his own manner, for thus he will always find a truth, or a kind of truth, which helps him through life. Modernists have no wish to impose their views on Traditionalists at the point of the bayonet, or to rob anyone of his ewe-lamb. If a man is satisfied, let him be satisfied. But the difficulty is that Modernist tolerance meets with no equivalent response; and as for the ewe-lamb, it is paraded through the streets and the claim made that all the traffic must be held up indefinitely on its account. The Modernist voices a very general feeling when he protests that the traffic should be held up no longer, for the congestion has become a public nuisance.

Dr. Sterrett's book, however, is not a mere compilation of generalities; he does supply his readers with some definite information about the history, methods, and ideals of Modernism, both in the Church of England and in the Church of Rome, where 'it was gored to death by two Papal bulls.' An appendix is also added on American Modernism, which has its own history to make. In this connection Dr. Sterrett wisely reminds his countrymen that Liberals have only themselves to thank if they are crushed out of existence through failure to organize. As readers of the July *Modern Churchman* remember, Modernist organisation has already begun across the Atlantic. With regard to English Modernism, the author has evidently gone to great pains to secure accurate information, but it is not surprising that in some not very important details it has been inadequately obtained; this is of less importance, however, as the general impression conveyed is a correct one, and the slips which have occurred can easily be rectified in a second edition, which we hope will be soon called for. We feel grateful to Dr. Sterrett for his timely book, and the good service he has rendered to the cause of Modernism.

Dr. Faulkner's volume, though it too is an American production, exhibits an entirely different point of view. Here we have an elaborate apology for the conservative position in theology. The book cannot be

said to add any new arguments to those which have been offered by more ingenious apologists on this side of the Atlantic. Yet we shall gladly allow that Dr. Faulkner conducts his polemics quietly, and though we are left unconvinced by his logic (or rather, by his premises, which are of the customary *a priori* kind), we are not irritated by appeals to ecclesiastical prejudice, or by charges of bad faith. It scarcely needs to be observed that the author falls into the usual error which identifies Modernism with a particular set of opinions. Ritschl bulks very large in Dr. Faulkner's imagination, and though we should be the last to minimise the work and influence of that important thinker, we doubt if his prestige is so great to-day as it was twenty or thirty years ago. Roman Modernism in the hands of Tyrrell may have been a mixture of Ritschl and William James, but though Anglican Modernists respect and value the work of Tyrrell, they do not accept him as final, and some of them are flatly opposed to his whole attitude. J.C.H.

PARENTS AND TEACHERS.[1]

It is not altogether without significance that when, 'at the instance of the Christian Evidence Society,' a volume of essays is produced 'to furnish guidance to those who are entrusted with the responsible work of educating children in the principles and practice of the Christian religion, and to help them in dealing with the problems and difficulties which arise in the course of instruction,' recourse should be had to scholars, the majority of whom are either in sympathy with, or actual members of, the *Churchmen's Union*. Three of them even contributed papers at the now notorious Girton Conference.

It would appear that when it is a question of recommending the doctrines of Christianity to the educated public, there are advantages in making use of those whose accurate knowledge, trained powers of reasoning, and sound religious instincts enable them to form judgments which carry weight with the lay mind. That these qualities should have led those who possess them to embrace a type of theological thought which is to be described as 'liberal,' has not been felt to compromise their competency to act as purveyors of religious ideas for the rising generation.'

We propose to transcribe a few passages which will indicate how much the Christian Evidence Society is alive to the apologetic value of Liberal scholarship: 'It is a philosophical merit in Christianity to attach importance to historical facts; but this does not guarantee the truth of any particular fact to which Christian teachers have attached importance—that must be ascertained by an examination of the evidence in each case.'[2]

'Sincerity in belief is an indispensable condition of true religion, but the truth of a fact does not depend on the sincerity or warmth of the conviction any more than the satisfaction of hunger depends on the firm belief that a meal is ready . . . We should strive after clearness of thought in matters of religion. The aim of religion on the side of the intellect is to apprehend God as He has actually revealed Himself in history—that is, in the affairs of men as we know them in the past or present.'[3]

'The Bible is a religious book. Its purpose is not to teach science, but to teach religion. It tells us about God and our duties towards Him.

[1] *The Christian Faith.* Essays for the use of Parents and Teachers. Edited by Rev. C. F. Nolloth, M.A., Litt.D. (John Murray. 7/6 net.)

[2] Prof. C. C. J. Webb on *Religion and Philosophy*, p. 10.

[3] H. U. Weitbrecht Stanton, Ph.D., D.D., in *The Comparative Study of Religions*, p. 43.

Its writers took the learning and science of the day, subordinated them to that end, and made them teach men some truth about God. . . Similarly, the Biblical writers took the old national traditions and songs that we find in the Book of Judges, re-edited them, and made them tell us some religious truth . . . Parts of the old traditions may have no basis in fact, but the religion that they teach is true.'

'It is not the printed word of the book that is inspired, but the soul of the writer . . . It is as obvious as anything can be that the inspiration of a prophet did not destroy his individuality, nor make him incapable of error.'[4]

Dr. Peake's remarks on the Gospel miracles are not without interest:

'The miraculous element is very prominent even in our earliest narrative . . . There is a general tendency to allow that the cases of healing may, as a whole, be historical . . . With reference to other wonderful works, it ought to be said at the outset that we are committed to no theory of the events, but at most to the fact that they occurred. The drift of recent thought has been to make us more cautious in drawing the line between the possible and the impossible. And we may find that they constitute no violation of natural order. Still, we justly demand unusually strong evidence for events so abnormal . . .

'It is a mistake to suppose that critical theories are mainly inspired by the desire to get rid of the supernatural. They are largely suggested by the comparison of the documents with each other, or of different sections within the same document. It is undeniable that the accounts of the same incident frequently differ . . . and not infrequently it is possible to explain what causes were operative in creating the secondary out of the original version' (pp. 127*f.*).

The following passage from Dr. Barnes' essay on the bearing of modern psychology on religious teaching should help to prevent those who read it from falling victims to an undesirable form of religious emotionalism:

'One danger is common to every religious use of the process of suggestion. Whenever devotional fervour is quickened at some service of special significance—whether it be a revivalist meeting or a celebration of the Eucharist—the religious beliefs of those whose influence is dominant tend to be uncritically accepted by the rest. The ordinary worshipper thus puts his religious experience in the mould provided for him. He accepts not merely the fact of the Spirit's presence and influence, but also the interpretation of that fact which is offered to him. As a consequence, he is convinced that an unexamined system of doctrine is absolutely true. Thus it comes about that a belief in the infallibility of the Scriptures, or in transubstantiation, may be held with fanatical zeal. It cannot be too strongly emphasised that sound theology is the result of prolonged and patient intellectual inquiry. Beliefs have no valid basis when they are acquired by passive obedience to suggestion' (pp. 235*f.*).

We should absorb a disproportionate amount of space did we allow ourselves to quote further from this book. It must not be supposed that we have searched diligently for startling utterances and selected the most extreme passages. The extracts given have been typical. If this is what the rising generation is to be brought up on, they will be more fortunate than we who preceded them: their Christianity will be rational, moral, and spiritual—and (it is to be hoped) they will insist on having a Church and services which try to embody those ideals. J.C.H.

[4] W. M. Bell, B.D., in *The Bible and Science*, pp. 51 ff.

PSYCHOLOGY WITHOUT TEARS.[1]

When this little book was put into our hands for review, we uttered a sigh, for we are weary of popular psychology. Nevertheless, when we opened it, we read it to the end, for we were charmed by the simplicity of its style, and by the unpretentiousness of its language. Furthermore, it was discovered to be not only simple, but scientific (which, indeed, often amounts to the same thing).

The book is an exposition of those recent tendencies in psychology about which we may read much and understand little. It is all done in ninety-five pages, but no words are wanted, and we are not treated to little sermons on religion and ethics by the way. Miss Firth mixes no water with her ink. Nor does the writer go out of her way to regale her readers with unsavoury details, as is usually considered necessary in an exponent of the New Psychology. Though, if she is free from what has been called *la nostalgie pour la boue,* she is quite untainted with sentimentality of the early Victorian type.

We ourselves feel particularly grateful for the careful distinction drawn by Miss Firth between what is technically known as Repression, and what is known as Dissociation—terms sometimes used as if they were interchangeable. Repression means that certain ideas, when they rise to consciousness, are thrust back into the subconscious, lest they should translate themselves into action; Dissociation means that some of these repressed ideas may lead an active life in the subconscious, and cause trouble not only there, but also in the conscious levels of the mind. 'If an idea associated with some strong emotion is repressed into the subconscious, that emotion will, as it were, vivify it, and cause it to have an independent life of its own; it splits off from the personality and is said to be dissociated' (p. 63).

So grave are the consequences of dissociation, that some *esprits forts* among psychologists have advised us to eschew repression altogether lest our mentality should suffer dissociation. The advice, however, is generally recognised to be too idealistic; for if we repressed nothing, we should quickly be suppressed by our fellow-citizens, and subjected to forcible restraint. Miss Firth reminds us that 'Repression need not necessarily imply dissociation . . . Dissociation would never occur if we were honest with ourselves. When we refuse to admit, even to ourselves, that our nature possesses certain primitive aspects, we prevent the ideas connected with these aspects from being affiliated to our personality and taking their place in our mental life; they therefore become foreign bodies in the mind technically termed dissociated complexes . . .' (p. 88).

This book should be in the hands of all parents, teachers, and clergymen. The latter would receive more reliable instruction from it than they will discover in some manuals of a more definitely theological complexion.

J.C.H.

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR,

CREEDS OR NO CREEDS.

While fully appreciating Mr. Hardwick's review of Dr. Harris's work on this subject, I think that he somewhat underrates it. The strong recommendation with which it has been received by some of the prominent religious journals, shows that it requires careful consideration. As Dr.

[1] *The Machinery of the Mind.* By VIOLET M. FIRTH. (Allen & Unwin. 3/6 net.)

Harris singles out for especial attack my *Exploratio Evangelica*, I think I ought briefly to state my view of his polemic.

I frankly welcome the volume, little as I agree with it. I have long held that, next to the setting forth of truth, no service could be greater to religious thought than the setting forth of error in a methodical and logical, and therefore easily refuted, form. Such merit Dr. Harris attributes to my book, and such merit I am quite ready to attribute to his. One finds it much more instructive and stimulating than books which set forth a superficial and muddle-headed compromise.

Dr. Harris finds the whole roots of the Modernist theology in the tendencies of the post-Kantian philosophy, and especially in the marked tendency towards Pragmatism. I quite agree with him that some form of Pragmatism furnishes the best and most logical justification of that theology. But some of the Modernists, notably Dean Rashdall, are strongly opposed to that tendency. The other root of Modernism, the new scientific view of history, Dr. Harris almost overlooks. He does indeed speak of the literary criticism of the documents of early Christianity which was undoubtedly carried to an unjustifiable extreme in the last generation. But of the application of the theory of evolution to Church history he seems, like most of his school, to have little idea. To this point I will return later.

Of course it is quite impossible in a couple of pages to discuss the fundamental differences between Dr. Harris's position and mine. He does me the honour to refute my main principles in three pages: but as he overthrows the systems of Kant and of Hegel in the same summary fashion, I cannot feel ill-treated. He finds in my introductory chapters verbal inconsistencies. If so, they are of the same kind as the inconsistencies which arise when we speak at once of the sun rising and of the earth revolving, or of grass being green and of green as a subjective phenomenon of sight. Philosophers have to use human language, and the more they try to escape from this necessity by inventing a technical language of their own, the more likely they are to set forth a scheme, well rounded indeed, but having little reference to actual things. Dr. Harris accuses me of rejecting the reality of the world of experience. I believe in reality as much as he does: but I do not think that objectivity is a matter of purely intellectual apprehension, but that it is contributed by the active powers of man.

I may confess that since I wrote, at the end of the last century, my views have somewhat developed. I should now express them in a less metaphysical and a more Pragmatist form: and this indeed I hope to do shortly. But the change will be rather in form than substance.

Dr. Harris's view of the actual condition of historical criticism is very superficial and imperfect. Here I venture to speak with some confidence, for the greater part of my life has been given to the examination of ancient history and historians, and the testing of received views by the application of archæological facts. Dr. Harris is quite mistaken in supposing that keen criticism in historical research is a result of the vogue of the Kantian philosophy. It is in a far greater degree the result of the immense progress in physical science, the methods of which, in greatly modified form, have affected historical study. He cites some of my archæological colleagues as having contributed to the verification of ancient history. It is a process to which I may claim also to have contributed. But if he imagines that the new studies will take us back to the historic views of pre-scientific times, he is completely mistaken: and no serious historian or archæologist would imagine such a thing.

Dr. Harris seems to fancy that the question is merely as to the criticism of ancient historians. It is far deeper and wider. Textual criticism, higher criticism, anthropology, archæology, comparative studies in religion all go to make up a mighty flood, which has its moments of regression, but on the whole advances steadily. In Christian history, just now, a revolt against the extreme and unbalanced views of such writers as Van Manen and Cheyne, Schmiedel and Schweitzer, has caused a certain conservative reaction, which is on the whole a healthy one. But that reaction cannot go beyond a certain point. To suppose that it will rehabilitate the historic methods of a century ago is a delusion. Dr. Harris may find refuge in the New Realism of my friend Professor Cook Wilson as regards philosophy. But where will he find in our Universities and Academies a great historian who will sweep away the work of Mommsen and Lightfoot, of Harnack and Duchesne, and the rest, and return to the fanciful construction which passed as Church history a century ago?

The most serious defect of Dr. Harris's book is its completely negative and destructive character. The Modernists may fairly reply to him that he carries negation much further than they do. He can attack current views in philosophy and history with much acumen. But he gives us nothing to put in their place. One might suppose that he wishes merely to go back to the orthodoxy of the Roman Church: but this in his preface he emphatically denies. He writes: 'Philosophy is a progressive science, but to put the clock back to the thirteenth century, as if nothing important had been discovered since, seems to me a mistaken, even a fatal policy.' But I fear that he will be unable to stop short of that point. Some very able theologians of the Roman Church have seen this clearly, and have been more thorough-going. Professor Ehrhard sees that it is necessary from this point of view to throw aside not only Kant, but the whole of modern philosophy from Descartes onwards, and to go back to Thomas Aquinas; and this view Leo XIII officially accepted, and established Aquinas at Louvain and elsewhere. But, as Mr. Hardwick points out, Aquinas was in his day a great Modernist; his distinction between reason and revelation being a well-spring of heresy. I fear we must go further back still in philosophy, and history in the modern sense of the term must become anathema.

At the same time I must confess some sympathy for Dr. Harris. If I thought, as he does, that Kantism and Pragmatism led necessarily to the rejection of the main principles of Christianity, I would have none of them. But if we turn to the most authoritative documents of Christianity, what do we find? Jesus himself laid the foundation-stone of the principle of relativity in his saying, 'The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath.' And He laid down the principle of Pragmatism in the words, 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' St. Paul was the greatest of Modernists in his endeavour to re-express the truths of Judaism in the new light of the revelations of Christianity.

And as regards ethics. I am keenly and painfully alive to the present unsettlement of Christian morality. But it is not due to Modernism, but to covetousness and materialism. I must be allowed to say that my own *Evolution in Christian Ethics* differs but little in principle from Father Cuthbert's *Catholic Ideals in Social Life*. It is quite certain that Modernism, like every other tendency, will have to undergo the test of fruits. This is a matter in which Dr. Harris dogmatizes: but his argument is not based upon facts, but upon *a priori* suppositions.

P. GARDNER.